



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice and participation of the Holy ...

George Trevor





H. P. Musgrave

Etton.

1076

THE
CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
OF THE
SACRIFICE AND PARTICIPATION
OF THE
HOLY EUCHARIST.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

BY
GEORGE TREVOR, M.A., D.D.
CANON OF YORK ; RECTOR OF BEEFORD.

ἀβύρως θυόμενον.—*Act. Gen. Conc. Nic.*

Oxford and London :
JAMES PARKER AND CO.
1876.



JUN 3 1916

TO THE VERY REVEREND
WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., F.R.S.,
DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

MY DEAR DR. HOOK,

YOU grant me the favour which I covet most for my book, in allowing me to dedicate it to the most conspicuous representative of the *Via Media* of the Church of England.

To you I had recourse to trace this middle way between the extremes of the present Eucharistic controversy, and it was only on your declining the task, that I found courage to essay it myself.

I had no wish to treat of the Eucharist at large, nor to add to the Devotional Manuals with which our Church is so richly supplied. All I thought necessary was, to re-assert two points, which seemed to be slipping out of view:—the symbolical nature of the Sacrifice, and the indispensable condition of Communion.

It is often overlooked, that the Blessed Sacrament represents, not the living Body of our dear Lord in glory, but His Body *slain* and His Blood *shed* in Sacrifice on the Cross. No one, of course, would

consciously deny a truth so elementary, that Jeremy Taylor accounts it "next to that which is evident in itself, and needing no further light, but the considering the words and the design of the Institution." Nevertheless, it was practically lost sight of in the Corporal tenet of the Middle Ages; and hence both the Tridentine corruption, and the Lutheran denial, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Both parties mistook the "Body and Blood" of the Sacrament for the glorified "Body" communicated in the worthy receiving of the Sacrament.

The mistake has been perpetuated by Ultra-Protestants, in the desire to heap odium on the Mass. Our great Anglican Divines have so continuously insisted on the distinction, that any present forgetfulness can only be due to the influence of the foreign books of devotion now circulated among us.

By reproducing the concordant testimony of the undivided Church and our own, I hoped to abate some present differences, and to promote a dutiful observance of our Established Liturgy.

In the present edition I have been induced, on the request of some esteemed correspondents in the United States of America, to fill in the original outline with further historical details. Our brother Churchmen across the Atlantic look for the solution of the ecclesiastical troubles, which they share with us, to the common heritage of the Anglo-Catholic theology. You will be pleased if my labours should in any degree contribute to an object which you have so long held

up to our pursuit ; and I can offer no better pledge of their purpose than by placing them under your protection. Your kind acceptance is another fruit of the friendship with which you have honoured me for thirty years.

Believe me always, with unabated respect and esteem,

My dear DR. HOOK,

Your obliged and affectionate friend,

GEORGE TREVOR.

BEEFORD,
Sept. 24, 1875.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE principle of this Essay is not speculative, but historical. Christianity is an historical religion, not a philosophical development. Its divisions are as historical as the partition of Poland, or the reprisals of the French and German Empires. Re-union is simply a return to the points of divergence. This is the Catholic principle, and the acknowledged rule of the English Reformation.

It justifies the retention of the primitive Greek appellation in common with the less exact terminology of our own language. *Holy Communion*, and *Lord's Supper*, have the authority of the English Church, as *Divine Liturgy* has of the Eastern, and *Mass* of the Western Communions. They have the further advantage of being Scriptural terms, but they do not appear to have been proper names, either of the Service or the Sacrament, till the third and fourth centuries^a.

^a In 1 Cor. x. 16 "communion" is used of the consecrated elements severally, but as a description rather than a name. The same Greek word, in Acts ii. 42, is distinguished from the "breaking of bread," and neither would appear to be a proper name, either of the whole service or the material symbol. The same doubt attends the term "Lord's Supper" in 1 Cor. xi. 20, where it is a further question whether it refers to the Eucharist or the attendant love-feast. "Communion" is found as a name in the Canons of the First General Council, and "Lord's

The oldest historical name of both is *Eucharist*: signifying nothing but "Thanksgiving," it has always been in universal use, and it is the name of nothing else. These are the prime requisites of a proper name.

The general object of the Essay is stated in the Dedication. This enlarged Edition contains a new chapter on Sacrifice in Holy Scripture. The Roman, Lutheran, and Anglican expositions are treated with greater fulness, and the citation is considerably expanded throughout. Of the Councils, Liturgies, and Fathers, the originals are given in the Appendix. It would have been easy to multiply the witnesses, but in a *consensus* the evidence of one is the evidence of all; and after consulting the *Catenæ* of both sides, and again going through all the Ante-Nicene writings, I may hope that nothing material is omitted.

These improvements have more than doubled the contents, and made it necessary to re-write the greater part of the volume; but the argument and general arrangement remain as before.

No pains have been spared to investigate the new dogma of the "*Objective Presence*," formulated by my dear friend, the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, in the

Supper" in S. Basil and subsequent Fathers. Though Maldonatus strangely censures it as a Protestant innovation, it is frequent in Tridentine divinity. Still "oblation" and "sacrifice" are older, and more general names. The most ancient and universal of all is *Eucharist*. The Syrian Version gives it to explain the breaking of bread in the Acts; and the original text of 1 Cor. xiv. 16, points to its being an apostolic name for the Service; in Justin Martyr it is extended to the Sacrament.

year 1848, and still without a place in scientific theology. By him, and doubtless by the great majority of those who use the expression, it was taken up as only another epithet for the Real Spiritual Presence of antiquity and our own divines. Others have since expounded it of the "co-existent" tenet of Martin Luther,—the one explanation that could never get footing in England, and by its disappearance in Germany is proved to be historically untenable. Later still, it has been defended as practically indistinguishable from Transubstantiation^b.

From this surprising diversity there is no appeal to antiquity, because antiquity had neither the word nor the idea. It is confessedly a term of modern philosophy, and our perplexity is increased by learning that in the metaphysical system from which it is borrowed, the "objective" is something certainly unknowable and probably non-existent; in this philosophy the "subjective" only is real^c. A term which is capable

^b The confusion seems to arise from substituting the living Person of Christ, the Bread of Life, in the place of the Body and Blood of the Sacrament. This mistake is traced by Waterland to an illiterate Eutychian heretic at the close of the seventh century. It was taken up by John Damascenus (A.D. 740), whose theory of *augmentation*, *assumption*, or *impanation*, the later Schoolmen replaced by *transubstantiation*. Luther adopted *consubstantiation*, or as his followers preferred to term it *union* or *co-existence*. All held the tenet condemned by the Church of England under the name of "corporal."

^c The modern inversion of the metaphysical term from the meaning assigned by our elder divines, is noticed at p. 215. An able article on the Kantian philosophy, published in the new "Church Quarterly Review," says that in this view the *objective* "is something which exists neither in space nor in time; it has neither quantity nor quality;

of so many interpretations has been wisely and charitably withdrawn by the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, in the second edition of his Bampton Lectures. Dogmatic confusion is the parent of the ritual diversities which alarm the public mind: the remedy lies in a stricter adherence to the language and teaching of the times to which we all appeal.

To enforce a Puritan uniformity, would be to invite the fate of Hippolytus. The age of legal coercion is past: the substitution of parliamentary enactments for canons ecclesiastical, has resulted in the *minimum* of uniformity with the *maximum* of irritation. All existing Dissent is historically due to the efforts of the State to compel uniformity. Its tribunals, from the Star Chamber to the Scottish Court of Session, have invariably precipitated the schisms they sought to restrain^d. Their hard, unsympathising pe-

it is neither substance nor accident, neither cause nor effect; and it exists neither necessarily nor contingently. How any one can imagine that such an object can by any possibility exist at all, it is not easy to see," (p. 75). At all events, it is beyond the power of human cognition, and at best problematical. Now that English Churchmanship has at last vindicated its claim to a Theological Review, instead of lying at the mercy of party journals, it is to be hoped that the question will be treated with greater exactness.

^d The lay estates of Parliament have always been more intolerant of religious scruples than the spiritual. It was on the petition of the House of Commons that the infamous statute for burning heretics by the king's writ was passed in 1401: the Church could inflict only spiritual censures. In the reign of Charles I., the House of Commons complained vehemently that, under the malignant influence of Archbishop Laud, the statutes for putting Popish priests to death were allowed to be evaded. On the Restoration, the bishops wished the Crown to have

dantry is especially out of date at a time when our Book of Common Prayer, from a schedule to the Act of Uniformity, has grown into the spiritual inheritance of Churches beyond the jurisdiction of our insular courts. To these at least the historical mind of the English Church, not the technical construction of our penal statutes, must supply the true interpretation of her doctrine and discipline. Writing as a divine, not a lawyer, I have purposely omitted all reference to the conflicts of the forum.

I regret to have lost in this Edition the advantage enjoyed in the first, from the supervision of the proof-sheets by the late lamented Archdeacon Freeman. His counsel and approval never ceased to encourage my labours.

A more recent loss, sustained on the very eve of publication, is the death of the honoured Dean of Chichester. The Dedication is left with the date of his acceptance, as a last tribute of our friendship.

a power of exempting tender consciences from the strict rule of the Ritual: but the House of Commons, remembering the intolerance of the Presbyterians and Independents, not only refused the least relaxation, but imposed heavier penalties than ever on Nonconformity. The secession of S. Bartholomew's day, often attributed to the Church, was in truth the act and design of the State, in order to reduce the Church to a more servile subjection to itself. This intolerance is quite consistent with the hostility to spiritual authority ever manifested by Parliament before and after the Reformation, as well as with its later eagerness (for political purposes) to make exaggerated concessions to the sects it created in 1662. The glory of a parliament is to enforce its own will; it cannot be expected to shew that tenderness for difficulties of conscience which is imperative on those to whom the cure of souls is committed.

That he can never see the book in which he expressed the warmest interest, is to me an unlooked-for calamity.

All the more grateful is the encouragement spontaneously extended from the other side of the Atlantic. To Dr. Buel, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Seminary of the American Church at New York, and to Professors Pynchon and Hart of my own College at Hartford, I am indebted for the most friendly interest, and not a few valuable suggestions. The Bishops of Maryland, Western New York, North Carolina, Pittsburgh and Long Island, (Drs. Whittingham, Cleveland Coxe, Lyman, Kerfoot, and Littlejohn,) have cheered me with their aid and support.

To the Right Rev. John Williams, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Connecticut, and Chancellor of Holy Trinity College, Hartford, this enlarged Edition chiefly owes its existence. Originating in his suggestion, it has been sustained by his continuous correspondence, and crowned, at his instance, with the highest academical Degree in the gift of the distinguished College over which he presides. My warmest thanks are tendered to his Lordship and the whole Senate, for an honour which unites me at once with a leading Institution of the American Church, and the oldest of her Episcopal Dioceses;—with the cradle of her Liturgy, and the orbit of the first star in her Apostolical Succession, the truly Catholic SAMUEL SEABURY.

I am deeply grateful for the kind terms in which the Essay was mentioned by my Diocesan, the Lord

Archbishop of York, in the Convocation of this Province.

Last, and not least, I wish to acknowledge the liberality of my spirited Publishers, who, frankly telling me that "a work which is moderate, and does not appeal to any ultra-party, though all the more useful and valuable, is in the present excitement all the more unsaleable," determined, nevertheless, to undertake a risk which to the Author would have been fatal.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THESE pages are not designed to attempt a new exposition of the Sacred Mysteries, but to vindicate from recent misconceptions the old Catholic Doctrine of the Memorial Sacrifice, and Real Participation, of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. The authorities adduced, in exposition of Holy Scripture, are the Councils, Liturgies, and Fathers before the division of East and West, together with the Liturgy and standard Divines of the Church of England.

The same authorities have been lately claimed for conclusions to which they are, in truth, strongly opposed. The old Catholic phraseology is unhappily being more and more limited to the Tridentine interpretation. The Real Presence, which Bishop Cosin affirms and proves to be common to all Protestant Confessions, is now sought to be restrained to the Church of Rome, and one section of the Anglican Communion. The Eucharistic Sacrifice, taught by all our great theologians, is to a large extent confounded with the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is a natural though startling sequel, that one of these miscalled High Churchmen at last reaches the con-

clusion, that England and Rome are absolutely at one on the very doctrine which historically formed the chief ground of their separation ^a !

These reactionary paradoxes are aided rather than restrained by indiscriminate opposition. The Churchmanship of our day happily revolts from all that goes to lower or rationalize the Christian mysteries. In view of the secular tendencies of the age, it clings the more fervently to the Catholic tradition, which may soon be our only bond of union, when temporal Establishments shall have ceased to exist. The present Essay is an appeal to Catholic tradition; to Church authority against private judgment; to the simplicity of the universal Faith against an overbearing Scholasticism, which, in seeking to localize the spiritual, darkens what it affects to define, and desecrates the ark it desires to uphold.

It is the diversity of Doctrine which creates and gives importance to our Ritual diversities; these can never be satisfactorily adjusted while the standards of teaching are misunderstood.

I have long hoped to see the task of restoring the balance undertaken by some more competent writer; but perhaps an imperfect attempt may be less dangerous than a delay which has already been too long for the peace of the Church.

Happily no new and independent exploration of the Fathers is required: on the contrary, the citation is

^a "The Kiss of Peace; or, England and Rome at one on the Eucharist. By G. F. Cobb, Trin. Coll., Camb."

best limited to the beaten path of our own theology. It is not what the private judgment of learned men may now find in antiquity, but what the Church of England has taken from it as Catholic truth, that her children require to be told.

The publication of this Essay is due to the encouragement derived from the subscriptions of the late lamented Archbishop of Canterbury; of my diocesan, the Archbishop of York; of the Lord Primate of Ireland; the Bishop Primus of Scotland; the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; and Twenty-one other Bishops of the Anglican Communion. To these Prelates, with the several Dignitaries and Professors who have been pleased to honour me with the same mark of confidence, my grateful thanks are due.

To Archdeacon Freeman I am further indebted, not only for an easy access to the valuable stores collected in his "Principles of Divine Service," but for much assistance in the laborious task of verifying the references, and for his most kind and careful revision of the proof sheets of this Publication.

BURTON ST. PETER'S,
December, 1868.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

	PAGE		PAGE
Eucharist the chief act of		Objections of Luther and	
Christian worship	1	Calvin	9
Always deemed a Sacrifice . . .	<i>ib.</i>	False definitions of Bellar-	
Primarily the whole action . . .	2	mine	10
Secondarily the material sym-		Spiritual Sacrifice not meta-	
bols	<i>ib.</i>	phorical	<i>ib.</i>
S. Augustine's definition . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Waterland's rebuke of	
Lucretian argument	<i>ib.</i>	Hooker	11
Prophets and Fathers	3	Injury to the Protestant ar-	
Mistaken views of Old Testa-		gument	12
ment sacrifices	<i>ib.</i>	Church of England appeals	
Changed, not abrogated, in		to Antiquity	13
New Testament	5	Dispute upon words	14
False distinction of Sacrifice		Sacrifice a symbolical act of	
and Oblation	<i>ib.</i>	worship	<i>ib.</i>
Neither altar nor fire essen-		The Body sacrificed and the	
tial	6	Body mystical	15
Novelty of the objection . . .	<i>ib.</i>	S. Augustine, Thomas of Aquino,	
Question of names in New		Peter Lombard, Cran-	
Testament	7	mer	<i>ib.</i>
Early Reformers called it a			
Sacrifice	8		

CHAPTER II. SACRIFICE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

First and last in the Bible . . .	16	Expiation and mediation . . .	18
Always a type of the Lamb		Peace-offerings	<i>ib.</i>
of God	<i>ib.</i>	Levitical Burnt-offering con-	
Properly the act of worship,		tinuous and central	19
secondarily the gift	<i>ib.</i>	Meat and Drink-offerings . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Gifts of Cain and Abel both		The Memorial (<i>azkarah</i>) re-	
sacrifices	17	presentative and communi-	
Noah's Burnt-offering	<i>ib.</i>	cative	20
Meaning of the Hebrew word	18		

	PAGE		PAGE
Incense an <i>Azkarah</i> . . .	20	Ceremonial efficacy . . .	32
Peace-offerings for lay Com- munion . . .	21	Sacrifice like Sacrament . .	<i>ib.</i>
Sacrifice of praise or thanks- giving . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Typical character not in- vented in New Testament . .	33
Note on remnant of the Drink-offering . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Christianity the pre-ordained growth of the Law . . .	34
Memorial, a remembrance to God . . .	22	No solution of continuity in the worship . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Eating, the condition of im- putation . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Sacrifice lost to the Syna- gogue, not the Church . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Passover, a Peace- offering . . .	23	Christ a True Sacrifice . .	35
Spiritual use of "Eating and Drinking" . . .	<i>ib.</i>	So also the means of union with Him . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Sin-offering peculiar to Le- vitical ritual . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Unscriptural view of Levi- tical Sacrifices . . .	36
Treatment of Flesh and Blood .	<i>ib.</i>	Bishop Andrewes . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Priest's office began after the slaying of the victim . . .	24	Sacrifice in Apocalypse . .	37
Blood the witness of death . .	25	The Lamb on the Throne . .	<i>ib.</i>
Atonement and purification the leading ideas . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Presentation of the Sacrifice of the Cross . . .	38
Solemn form on the Day of Atonement . . .	26	And of the worship of the Church . . .	39
Remembrance of the Sin- offering . . .	27	Sacrifice not abolished, but glorified . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The people sacrificers . . .	28	One only Sacrifice of inherent virtue . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Meaning of word "Priest" . .	<i>ib.</i>	All others relative and sym- bolical . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Sons of Aaron not a <i>caste</i> . .	29	No essential difference be- tween Gifts and Prayers . .	40
Moses, not Aaron, the media- tor of the law . . .	30	Words not more evangelical than action . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Levitical worship essentially spiritual . . .	31		

CHAPTER III. THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST.

Sacraments always what Christ ordained . . .	42	A Sacrifice of Thanksgiving .	43
Ritual varying — Grace the same . . .	<i>ib.</i>	The Paschal Supper . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Eucharist grafted on Passover .	<i>ib.</i>	Parallel and Difference of the Eucharist . . .	44
Passover, the Lord's Sacrifice, instituted before the event it commemorated . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Accounts of the Institution .	<i>ib.</i>
		Variations reconciled . . .	45
		Apostolic ritual . . .	46

CONTENTS.

xix

PAGE	PAGE
All the parts originally inter- twined 46	Communion with Christ not otherwise expressed . . . 59
Prayer of Consecration in John xvii. 47	Change of subject in v. 51 . . 60
Sacrifice of Christ our Pass- over 48	Flesh and Blood the Gifts . . <i>ib.</i>
Sacramental remembrance . . 49	Distinct figures of Bread and Flesh <i>ib.</i>
<i>Anamnesis</i> in LXX. and New Testament 50	Eating Flesh a partaking of the Sacrifice 61
A Remembrance to God . . . 51	Our Lord's own distribution . <i>ib.</i>
A Shewing and a Communion . <i>ib.</i>	So in Prayer of Humble Ac- cess 62
The <i>Azkarah</i> of the Sacrifice . 52	Bread of Life <i>ib.</i>
Identification of the Holo- caust, the Memorial and the Remnant 53	Tridentine explanation . . . 63
New feature in the Commu- nion of the Blood <i>ib.</i>	Makes a new Sacrament in one Kind <i>ib.</i>
Three points noted 54	Romish charge of Nestorian- ism <i>ib.</i>
Discourse in John vi. 55	Doctrine of the Word made Flesh 64
Only other place that speaks of Eating Christ's Flesh and Drinking His Blood . . . <i>ib.</i>	Eutychnianism of the Triden- tine view 65
Polemical distinction <i>ib.</i>	Comparison with Sin-offering in Epistle to Hebrews . . <i>ib.</i>
Romish, Lutheran, and Cal- vinistic prejudice <i>ib.</i>	"The Altar," in Heb. xiii. . . 66
Injurious to the main article of Eucharistic grace . . . <i>ib.</i>	The Cross not an Altar . . . 67
Parallel expression in regard to Baptism 57	Reference to the Eucharistic Sacrifice <i>ib.</i>
Spoken before the Institution . <i>ib.</i>	Other Eucharistic references . 68
So also before the Passion . . 58	Paraphrase of the passage . . 69
No interpretation possible without the Eucharist . . <i>ib.</i>	Eucharist compatible with Le- vitical Sacrifices, not with the Heathen 71
Bengel <i>ib.</i>	Old Testament not contrary to the New <i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER IV. THE REAL PRESENCE.

Primitive Eucharistic rite . . 72	The Separation results from the new doctrine of the Presence 74
Note on the Mixed Cup . . . <i>ib.</i>	"Body and Blood" represent Christ <i>crucified</i> <i>ib.</i>
Observed by Celebrant only in the Roman Mass 73	Cajetan, Perron, Bellarmine . <i>ib.</i>
New rite of Adoration and Half Communion for others . <i>ib.</i>	Controversy relates to the Body glorified 75
The Sacrifice and the Sacra- ment indivisible <i>ib.</i>	

	PAGE		PAGE
Real Presence acknowledged in all Confessions . . .	76	Lateran doctrine supplanted at Constance . . .	82
Transubstantiation the peculiar tenet of Rome . . .	<i>ib.</i>	New doctrine of "Whole Christ" . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Metaphysical and Mechanical Arbitrary distinction by Thomas of Aquino . . .	76	Body and Blood supposed to be re-united in life . . .	84
Confusion of ideas . . .	<i>ib.</i>	"Concomitance" added at Trent . . .	85
Christ not contained in His Dead Body . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Two Christs . . .	<i>ib.</i>
True distinction by Waterland . . .	77	Contradictory propositions . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mistake of the <i>Corpus Mortuum</i> for the <i>Corpus Vivum</i> . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Transubstantiation given up . . .	86
Suppression of the Cup originally a heresy . . .	78	Literal interpretation abandoned . . .	87
Condemned by the Popes . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Words of Institution superseded . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Steeped sop forbidden . . .	<i>ib.</i>	No <i>Sacrament</i> in John vi. . .	88
Council of Constance sides with the Manichean heresy . . .	79	The <i>Sacrament</i> cannot be what it does not represent . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Council of Trent . . .	80	Question of Blood in Body glorified . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Insufficiency of excuses . . .	<i>ib.</i>	The <i>Sacrament</i> is the Blood shed . . .	89
Real cause, the new doctrine . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Represented, not contained . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Transubstantiation first appears in 1057 . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Protest of the Cup . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Derived from the exploded metaphysics of <i>Substance</i> and <i>Accidents</i> . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Corporeal Presence useless . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Decree of Lateran Council . . .	81	Spiritual benefit of the Sacramental action . . .	90
Wholly grounded on Communion . . .	82	Subverted by the Corporal tenet . . .	91
Communion in Both Kinds previously universal . . .	<i>ib.</i>	The Eucharist turned into an idol . . .	92
		Perverse speculation . . .	93

CHAPTER V. THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Change introduced by new doctrine of the Presence . . .	94	His Sacrifice <i>inferred</i> . . .	99
Sacrifice of the Early Church . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Type first applied to Communion . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Mass another Sacrifice . . .	95	Not found in Scripture . . .	100
Bellarmino, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Fathers could not make a type . . .	101
Tridentine decree . . .	96	Not in the Earliest Fathers . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Sacrifice representative . . .	97	Not in Liturgies or Canons . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Melchisedekian controversy . . .	98		

PAGE	PAGE
Admitted by Taylor, denied by Andrewes 101	Masses for the Dead 106
The <i>Oblata</i> always Bread and Wine 102	Solitary Masses <i>ib.</i>
Cyprian and Augustine <i>ib.</i>	Latin tongue 107
Second chapter of Tridentine decree 103	Anathemas <i>ib.</i>
Body and Blood disappear <i>ib.</i>	Summary 108
Elements changed into the living Christ <i>ib.</i>	Effect of the <i>hoc est</i> 109
Contradiction in terms 104	Oblation and Communion <i>con-</i> <i>current</i> 110
Not One Sacrifice <i>ib.</i>	Roman difficulty in defining the Sacrifice 111
Not Unbloody <i>ib.</i>	Non-Communicants excluded 112
Not Whole Christ 105	Bossuet's explanation <i>ib.</i>
Means not identical with the Grace 106	Matter of Sacrifice, Bread and Wine 113
	Materialism 114

CHAPTER VI. THE LUTHERAN HYPOTHESIS.

Consubstantiation or Co-existence 115	Sacramental Union 124
Luther's explanation <i>ib.</i>	Gerhard's explanation <i>ib.</i>
Elevation of the Host 116	Substance confounded with Sacrament <i>ib.</i>
Unworthy Reception <i>ib.</i>	Pfaff on the Presence 126
Protestant Canon <i>ib.</i>	Approximation to Calvin <i>ib.</i>
No Presence but in Communion 117	Higher views of the Sacrifice <i>ib.</i>
The interpretation not literal <i>ib.</i>	Still mechanical <i>ib.</i>
Makes two objects of Adoration 118	Difference from Hooker 127
Rejects the Sacrifice 119	Censure of S. Augustine <i>ib.</i>
Never accepted in England 120	Further from Antiquity than the Roman 128
Questioned in Germany <i>ib.</i>	Irreconcilable with Words of Institution <i>ib.</i>
Superseded by Calvinist and Zwinglian explanations <i>ib.</i>	And with the Fathers <i>ib.</i>
Calvin's Middle Way 121	Contributes nothing to the Mystery <i>ib.</i>
Virtual Presence 122	Disclaimer of the word <i>Cor-</i> <i>poral</i> 129
Struggles of the <i>Formula Concordiæ</i> 123	Teaching of the Fathers 130

CHAPTER VII. THE ANGLICAN DOCTRINE.

Character of the English Reformation 131	Papal Usurpation 132
Church of England always national <i>ib.</i>	Abolished before any change of doctrine 133
	National organization <i>ib.</i>

	PAGE		PAGE
Royal Supremacy . . .	133	<i>Ubi Corpus ibi Christus</i> . . .	145
English Churchmen never members of the Church of Rome . . .	134	No Hypostatic Union with the Sacrament . . .	146
Rule of Faith . . .	135	Real Presence fourfold . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Communion in Both Kinds . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Discriminated by Faith . . .	147
Repudiation of Corporal Pre- sence . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Glorified Body in Heaven . . .	148
Eucharistic Sacrifice . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Present by conjunction with Deity . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Opinions of the Bishops . . .	136	Personal Presence in the faithful receiver . . .	<i>ib.</i>
First English Liturgy . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Mystical Presence in the ele- ments . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Changes in the Second Book . . .	137	Presence known by power and operation . . .	149
No change of doctrine . . .	<i>ib.</i>	True and literal reading of the Institution . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Altar and Table declared in- different . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Rationalistic objection . . .	150
Articles of Religion . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Repudiated in Articles and Homilies . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Tridentine Decrees rejected . . .	138	Invalidates Consecration . . .	151
Sacrifice implied in valid Communion . . .	139	Consecration the condition precedent . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Both Kinds indispensable . . .	<i>ib.</i>	The Spirit acts by matter . . .	152
Commemoration of the Cross . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Invocation of the Liturgies . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Spiritual Presence . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Property of Sacraments . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Grace imputed to Communi- cants only . . .	<i>ib.</i>	In Baptism . . .	153
A true Presence and a true Sacrifice . . .	140	Reality not contingent on Faith . . .	<i>ib.</i>
"Jewel's Apology" . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Distinction between the Gifts and the Giver . . .	154
Canon 30 . . .	141	Middle Way of Church of England . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Difference between the Eu- charistic Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of the Cross . . .	142	Consensus of Divines . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Objects of Eucharistic Sacrifice . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Elfric the Grammarians . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Non-Communicants excluded . . .	143	English Church before the Conquest . . .	158
The Real Presence . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Lanfranc introduced the Cor- poral tenet . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Not in Elements apart from Communion . . .	144	Still the Cup retained, and no Adoration of the Host . . .	159
Scripture and Antiquity al- ways refer to oral partici- pation . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Wiclif . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Christ received Spiritually . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Rise of Greek learning . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Sacrament is His <i>slain</i> Body . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Dean Colet . . .	<i>ib.</i>
He Himself in the receiver . . .	<i>ib.</i>	English doctrine before Trent . . .	162
Union with Him the <i>effect</i> of Receiving . . .	145	Henry VIII. against Luther . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ambiguity of the common name . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Archbishop Cranmer . . .	<i>ib.</i>

	PAGE		PAGE
Bishop Ridley	164	Bishop Bull	197
<i>Diallacticon</i> of Sir Anthony		Bishop Burnet	198
Cooke	168	Bishop Beveridge	<i>ib.</i>
Bishop Ponet	170	Dr. Waterland	199
Bishop Bilson	171	His controversy with John-	
Bishop Jewel	173	son	203
Bishop Barlow	174	Rationalistic distinction	204
Bishop Andrewes	175	Similar mistake to that of	
His citation of Irenæus	178	the Schoolmen	205
Bishop Overall	186	Richard Bingham	<i>ib.</i>
Archbishop Laud	182	Johnson's theory	206
Bishop Lake	183	Rejects Real Presence	<i>ib.</i>
Archbishop Bramhall	<i>ib.</i>	And the Symbolical Sacrifice	207
Joseph Mede	185	No <i>Res Sacramenti</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Bishop Jeremy Taylor	186	Confusion of Presence with	
Bishop Patrick	189	Existence	208
Bishop Cosin	191	Argument illogical	<i>ib.</i>
Dr. Hammond	193	Probably misunderstood	210
Dr. Brevint	<i>ib.</i>	Drove Waterland to the op-	
Dean Aldrich	195	posite extreme	<i>ib.</i>
Thorndike	196	Oblation symbolical, Commu-	
Scrivener	<i>ib.</i>	nion real	<i>ib.</i>
Bishop Fell	<i>ib.</i>		

CHAPTER VIII. THE NEW OBJECTIVE THEORY.

Evil of new distinctions	211	Objective Presence a contra-	
Phrase undefined and novel	<i>ib.</i>	diction in terms	217
Doubtful whether a Corporal		First used by Archdeacon	
or Spiritual Presence	212	Wilberforce in 1848	<i>ib.</i>
Metaphysical term	<i>ib.</i>	In this meaning superfluous	218
Irrelevant to Divine Pre-		New Corporal signification	219
sence	<i>ib.</i>	Inaccuracy of the term	<i>ib.</i>
Insufficiency of the reason		The tenet really subjective	<i>ib.</i>
assigned	213	Not a question of Presence,	
Withdrawn by Bishop of Sal-		but of material inclusion	220
isbury	<i>ib.</i>	Confusion of ideas	<i>ib.</i>
Reverse of older meaning	214	Has resulted in Transubstan-	
Mede and Pearson	<i>ib.</i>	tiation	<i>ib.</i>
Meaning altered by Kant and		Authentic explanation	<i>ib.</i>
Fichte	215	Does not explain the word	221
Their distinction strictly im-		Avoids the point	<i>ib.</i>
possible	<i>ib.</i>	Doubtful if Transubstantia-	
Presence implies more than		tion is repudiated	222
Existence	216	The Lutheran Presence	
Subjective recognition re-		joined to the Tridentine	
quired	217	Mass	223

	PAGE		PAGE
Phrase, "under the forms,"		Dr. Pusey's "Letter to the	
not in the Homilies . . .	224	Bishop of London" . . .	233
Rejected by Church of Eng-		No allusion to this teaching .	234
land . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Nor to the "Objective Pre-	
The "two parts" of the		sence" . . .	235
Catechism . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Union of Lutheranism with	
Not physically united . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Romanism . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Part means power . . .	225	Remonstrance of Bishop Pat-	
Logical parts not substances	<i>ib.</i>	teson . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Archdn. Wilberforce's argu-		Ritual acts eclectic . . .	236
ment against material con-		Eucharistic Adoration . . .	237
tact . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Transubstantiation tries to	
Catechism asserts the Pre-		escape Idolatry . . .	<i>ib.</i>
sence in participation . . .	226	Adoration requires Annihila-	
Hooker's three expositions .	227	tion of the Elements . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Has a fourth been dis-		Limited to a Divine Person .	238
covered? . . .	228	No Hypostatic Union with	
Language on the Sacrifice .	<i>ib.</i>	the Elements . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Right in the true sense of		Christ to be Adored in	
the words . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Heaven . . .	239
Not in the Tridentine or Lu-		His Body circumscribed in	
theran . . .	229	Place . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mr. Keble's explanation . .	<i>ib.</i>	Bishop Bilson's Dialogue . .	<i>ib.</i>
Excludes the Elements . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Bishop Andrewes against the	
Which are the true <i>Oblata</i>		phrase, "under the forms" .	240
in the Fathers . . .	230	Censures the Adoration of	
Novel doctrine of the Me-		Christ in the Sacrament . .	<i>ib.</i>
memorial . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Jeremy Taylor makes it Idol-	
The fact apparently not true	231	atry . . .	241
The doctrine certainly not .	232	Johnson's repudiation . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Christ's Offering in Heaven .	233	Not the doctrine of Coun-	
Not a "Memorial" . . .	<i>ib.</i>	cils, Liturgies, or Fathers .	242

CHAPTER IX. COUNCILS AND LITURGIES.

Canons imply something to		The Viaticum . . .	245
be rectified . . .	243	Sacrifice and Altar . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Comparatively few on the		Acts, First General Council	246
Eucharist . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Unsacrificial Sacrifice . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Apostolical Canon III. . .	<i>ib.</i>	Quinisext Canon . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Date and authority . . .	244	Unbloody Sacrifice . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The oblation Bread and Wine	<i>ib.</i>	Water to be mixed with the	
Ancyran Canon I. . .	245	Wine . . .	247
Non-communicants . . .	<i>ib.</i>	No Reservation of the Sacra-	
Celebrant . . .	<i>ib.</i>	ment . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Penitents . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Story of Serapion . . .	<i>ib.</i>

	PAGE		PAGE
Altar Discipline . . .	247	Great Oriental Liturgy . .	261
Dismissal of Catechumens and Penitents . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Alexandrian Liturgy . .	<i>ib.</i>
Non-communicants . . .	248	Numerous variations . .	262
Justin Martyr . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Interpolations . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Alexandrian usage . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Clementine Liturgy . .	263
Excluded from the Offertory	<i>ib.</i>	Ante-Nicene . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Suspended and Excommuni- cated . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Six leading features . .	266
Council of Antioch . . .	249	Commemoration, Oblation, and Invocation . . .	267
Gloss refuted . . .	<i>ib.</i>	S. James's Liturgy . . .	269
Testimony of Greek Canonists	<i>ib.</i>	S. Basil's . . .	271
Case of the <i>Consistentes</i> . .	<i>ib.</i>	S. Chrysostom's . . .	273
No precedent for Voluntary Non-communication . .	250	Other forms . . .	277
Retired after the Kiss of Peace . . .	251	Oblation always of Unconse- crated Elements . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Noted by Justin . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Consecrated for Communion	<i>ib.</i>
Laodicean Canon . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Unbloody Oblation symbolical	278
Order of the earliest Liturgy	<i>ib.</i>	Seventh General Council .	<i>ib.</i>
<i>Anaphora</i> , Prayers of the Faithful, Kiss of Peace .	252	Images, Type, and Anti- type . . .	279
The Blessing before the Com- munion . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Latin doctrine originally the same . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Explicit testimony of S. Chrysostom . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Council of Florence . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Communion the one escape from the dilemma . . .	253	Greek doctrine . . .	280
Departure authorized . . .	254	Virtual Presence . . .	<i>ib.</i>
French Councils . . .	255	Communion universal . .	281
Blessing put after the Oblation	<i>ib.</i>	Position in Receiving . .	<i>ib.</i>
Non-communicants not pre- sent at the Participation .	<i>ib.</i>	Mixed Chalice . . .	282
Liturgies, Apostolical Con- stitutions . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Union of the Elements . .	<i>ib.</i>
How far Apostolic . . .	256	First step in the grand error	283
Reasonable presumption . .	257	Steepest sop forbidden . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ante-Nicene Liturgies pre- served by tradition . . .	258	Prayers for the Dead . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ritual of early Fathers . .	<i>ib.</i>	The Sacrifice of Prayer . .	284
Justin's account . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Canons and Liturgies . .	286
		No trace of Purgatory . .	287
		Use of Incense . . .	288
		Unknown to Early Church .	289
		Copied from Egyptian tem- ples . . .	<i>ib.</i>
		No bearing on the Presence .	290
		The great Entrance . . .	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER X. THE WESTERN LITURGIES.

Inferior to the Eastern . . .	291	No Oblation after Consecra- tion . . .	292
Roman and Gallican origin- ally Greek . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Place of the Kiss of Peace .	<i>ib.</i>

	PAGE		PAGE
France, Spain, and Britain,		Omission of the Invocation .	300
Oriental	292	Gregory's explanation . . .	301
Difference of Roman Mass .	<i>ib.</i>	Additions since Gregory .	<i>ib.</i>
Sacramentary of Gregory .	293	No verbal Oblation of Christ	302
Text uncertain	<i>ib.</i>	Institution fixed	303
Originally more like the Ang-		Invocation alterable . . .	<i>ib.</i>
lican	294	Both included in Consecra-	
Dean Field	<i>ib.</i>	tion	304
Use of Paris	<i>ib.</i>	Chrysostom	<i>ib.</i>
Modern Roman Missal . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Council of Florence . . .	305
Not the Tridentine Sacrifice	299	Comparison with our Bap-	
No Transubstantiation . .	<i>ib.</i>	tismal Office	<i>ib.</i>
Double Oblation	<i>ib.</i>	The Western Consecration	
The Host is still Bread . .	300	justified	<i>ib.</i>
Taken from the Greek . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Awful corruptions	306

CHAPTER XI. THE FATHERS.

Nature of their authority .	308	The Heavenly and the Earthly	
No <i>Calena</i> decisive	<i>ib.</i>	parts	323
Witnesses of Church teach-		Roman Explanations . . .	<i>ib.</i>
ing	309	Lutheran	324
Necessity of Consent and		Heavenly part a Gift, not	
Antiquity	<i>ib.</i>	a Substance	<i>ib.</i>
Appeal of Church of Eng-		Only three interpretations of	
land	<i>ib.</i>	the Mystery	325
Her own authority always		Lutheran or modern Objec-	
reserved	310	tive destructive of the Sac-	
Fathers had little Eucharistic		rament	<i>ib.</i>
controversy	<i>ib.</i>	Only one Substance	326
S. Clement of Rome	311	Not one thing in another,	
Parallel with Levitical Sac-		but one the Sacrament of	
rifices	313	another	<i>ib.</i>
Believed to be the ordi-		No metonymy or figure of	
nance of Christ	314	speech	<i>ib.</i>
S. Ignatius	<i>ib.</i>	Distinction from carnal Sac-	
Altar not metaphorical . .	315	rifice	327
Justin Martyr	<i>ib.</i>	Waterland's dogmatism . .	<i>ib.</i>
Irenæus	317	Irenæus reasons the other way	328
Offering of First-fruits . .	319	True differences	<i>ib.</i>
The New Oblation	322	Danger of depreciating the	
Fragment of Pfaff	<i>ib.</i>	material Oblation	329
Doctrine of Sacrifice accords		The visible the pledge of the	
with the Liturgies . . .	323	invisible	<i>ib.</i>

	PAGE		PAGE
Not a Sacrifice in the Gen- tile sense	330	Last Supper symbolical of the Cross	351
Athenagoras	<i>ib.</i>	Communion and Consump- tion of the Elements—no Adoration	352
First use of "Unbloody Wor- ship"	331	The Passion itself the Sacri- fice	<i>ib.</i>
Note on Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs	<i>ib.</i>	Chrysostom's qualification	<i>ib.</i>
Flowers and Incense	<i>ib.</i>	The Passion offered by offer- ing the Symbols	353
Clement of Alexandria	332	Roman Missal a protest against Trent	<i>ib.</i>
Spiritual Sacrifices	<i>ib.</i>	Eusebius of Cæsarea	354
Sacramental also	333	Spiritual Sacrifice offered in matter	355
Liturgical allusions—Mixed Chalice	<i>ib.</i>	Value derived from the spi- ritual state of the wor- shipper	357
The Blood twofold	334	Cyril of Jerusalem	<i>ib.</i>
Type of Melchisedek	<i>ib.</i>	Companion to the Altar	<i>ib.</i>
Origen	335	Directions for Receiving in Both Kinds	358
Anti-material language	<i>ib.</i>	Contrast with modern Mass <i>Type, Species, Form, Kind,</i> mean the Element itself, not the <i>Accident</i>	360
Counter testimony	<i>ib.</i>	Carries the value of what it represents	<i>ib.</i>
Agreement with Irenæus	336	S. Ambrose	361
Type of the Shew-bread	337	Anglican, not Roman or Lu- theran	362
Twofold Offering of the Blood	339	Meaning of "Spiritual Body"	363
The Presence Real but Spi- ritual	341	Not a phantom	364
Tertullian repeats the Unity of Substance	343	Nor Pantheistic	<i>ib.</i>
Reservation of the Sacrament Altar and Sacrifice	<i>ib.</i> 344	Figure of a mirror	365
Oblations for the Dead	345	S. Augustine	366
S. Cyprian	<i>ib.</i>	Local Extent essential to a Body	367
High views of the Sacrifice	<i>ib.</i>	Christ corporally absent	<i>ib.</i>
Distinguished from the Cross	346	Superiority of Sacraments to other means of Grace	368
Offering for the Dead	347	Symbols vary, Grace the same	<i>ib.</i>
Not necessarily in the Eu- charist	<i>ib.</i>	Passage in Art. XXIX.	369
Communion in Both Kinds	348	Type of Melchisedek	370
Unworthy Receiving	<i>ib.</i>	Spiritual Sacrifices	<i>ib.</i>
Allegory of the Mixed Cha- lice	349		
No ordained significance in the Water	350		
Elements <i>Symbolical</i>	<i>ib.</i>		
Sacrifice of Melchisedek	<i>ib.</i>		
The same matter as the Eu- charist	351		

	PAGE		PAGE
S. Chrysostom	371	Communion essential to the	
The Sacrifice Symbolical . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Sacrifice	377
One Sacrifice once Offered' .	372	Consecrated for no other use	<i>ib.</i>
Difference of Sacrifices embraced in one True Sacrifice	375	Union with Christ the spiritual effect	<i>ib.</i>
Oneness of Priest and People in Receiving	376	The Fathers unanimous in these propositions . . .	378
Summary of the first Four Centuries	377	Gradual rise of corruptions .	<i>ib.</i>
The Oblation is Bread and Wine	<i>ib.</i>	Englishmen related to the Fathers through the Church of England	379

CHAPTER XII. THE ENGLISH LITURGY.

Continuity of the National Church	380	No change of doctrine in the later editions . . .	390
Apostolical Succession . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Reasons of the Second Book	391
Dr. Döllinger's three modes of worship	<i>ib.</i>	Object of Ceremonies . . .	392
English Liturgy misplaced .	381	Rubrics not doctrinal . . .	393
The Roman Mass most unlike the Institution of any	<i>ib.</i>	Principles of Protestant Reformation	<i>ib.</i>
English Liturgy the most complete act of Communion	383	Adiaphoristic controversy .	<i>ib.</i>
A middle course	384	Luther's indifference to form	<i>ib.</i>
No forsaking of Catholicity .	<i>ib.</i>	Zwingli's opposite extreme	394
Assertion of national authority	385	Extravagant symbolism of his followers	395
Latin Offices not to be identified with modern Missal	386	Sitting made essential . . .	396
Oriental element in Britain .	<i>ib.</i>	Calvin's middle course . . .	397
Cup administered till near the Lateran Council . . .	<i>ib.</i>	Expelled from Geneva . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Superstitious significance of ceremonial	387	Little influence in England .	<i>ib.</i>
The Papacy an excrescence .	388	Luther's contempt for his opponents	<i>ib.</i>
Reformation under Edward VI.	<i>ib.</i>	His authority with English Reformers	398
Liturgy the standard of Sacramental doctrine	389	No Zwinglians among our Revisers	<i>ib.</i>
		Opposition of Hooper and Knox	399
		Principle of the Revision .	400
		Church robbery	<i>ib.</i>
		Destruction of Altars . . .	<i>ib.</i>
		Tables adjudged to be the same	401

PAGE	PAGE
Royal Mandate	Note on the uniform vesture
The Sacrifice affirmed . . . <i>ib.</i>	of 1662 415
Hooper compelled to submit . . . <i>ib.</i>	Eucharistic Sacrifice the
Table gesture prohibited . . . 403	whole act of worship . . . 416
Surplice instead of Vestments . . . <i>ib.</i>	Material Oblation symbolical 417
Position of Priest before the table <i>ib.</i>	Properly precedes the Consecration <i>ib.</i>
Kneeling reception <i>ib.</i>	Defects of the First Book . . . <i>ib.</i>
Indignation of the Zwinglians . . . 404	No Oblation of the Elements . . . 418
Firmness of Cranmer <i>ib.</i>	Superiority of present Liturgy <i>ib.</i>
The Black Rubric 405	Verbal Oblation of the Elements <i>ib.</i>
Forty-two Articles <i>ib.</i>	Bishop Patrick 419
Defect of the Zwinglians <i>ib.</i>	Offertory Prayer begins the Canon 420
Knox's relentless enmity . . . 406	Consecration perfected by Prayer <i>ib.</i>
Story of the Bishopric <i>ib.</i>	Mede's doctrine of Oblation . . . 421
Foreign Protestant influence . . . 407	Intervening matter <i>ib.</i>
Bucer, a Lutheran <i>ib.</i>	Need of subjective element . . . 422
Held the Real Presence 408	Prayer of the First Book . . . <i>ib.</i>
Calvin's views higher than the Calvinists' <i>ib.</i>	Improvement on Canon of the Mass 424
Bucer abused on both sides . . . 409	Novelty of some particulars . . . 425
Ambiguous language 410	Omissions in Second Book . . . <i>ib.</i>
Omission not Prohibition . . . <i>ib.</i>	Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner <i>ib.</i>
Power of the Crown 411	Invocation of the Spirit 426
Church Liturgy settled in 1662 <i>ib.</i>	Censure of the Nonjurors . . . <i>ib.</i>
Liturgies always differed . . . <i>ib.</i>	Implied in Consecration . . . <i>ib.</i>
Novelty of Uniformity <i>ib.</i>	Prohibition of Elevation . . . 427
Political and sectarian bigotry 412	Mistaken Censures 428
The Holy Table is an Altar . . . <i>ib.</i>	Oblation rejected in First Book <i>ib.</i>
Changes of material and shape in Old Testament . . . <i>ib.</i>	Difference of Greek Invocation 429
The Sacrifice God's Food, and the Altar His Table . . . 413	Error of the Roman Canon . . . <i>ib.</i>
Bishop Patrick <i>ib.</i>	Omission of "Memorial" clause 430
Wooden Altars primitive . . . <i>ib.</i>	Office of the Nonjurors . . . <i>ib.</i>
Position of Priest incidental to that of the Altar <i>ib.</i>	Their Sacrifice is of the Elements 431
In the Temple faced the west <i>ib.</i>	Scottish Liturgy <i>ib.</i>
Christian usage of praying to the east 414	American Liturgy 434
No doctrinal significance . . . <i>ib.</i>	
Vestments originally common costume 415	

	PAGE		PAGE
All adopt the Eastern Consecration	436	Represents the Blood of the Cross	445
Our Post-Communion prayers	<i>ib.</i>	Retained by Early Reformers	446
The Reasonable Sacrifice	<i>ib.</i>	Never forbidden	447
Special feature of the English Liturgy	437	Disused in the Rebellion	<i>ib.</i>
Lay-Communion taken into the Canon	<i>ib.</i>	Omission of the water tolerated, but not enjoined	448
Removal of the unprimitive and dangerous interval	438	Meaning of the word "wine"	<i>ib.</i>
Difference of the Lutheran Office	<i>ib.</i>	Intercessions for the Departed	449
Twofold breaking of the Bread	<i>ib.</i>	Neither unlawful nor necessary	<i>ib.</i>
The true Unbloody Sacrifice	439	A question of Church order	<i>ib.</i>
Note on the Priest's position	<i>ib.</i>	Original object	450
Advantage of the arrangement	440	Abused by false doctrine	<i>ib.</i>
Objection as to the matter of the Sacrament	441	Palmer's justification of the omission	<i>ib.</i>
Unleavened bread not essential	<i>ib.</i>	Requisites of a Catholic Liturgy	451
No Catholic usage	442	Value of the present settlement	452
Retained by Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli	<i>ib.</i>	Danger of new ceremonies	<i>ib.</i>
Custom of English Churchmen before the Rebellion	443	Power of interpretation belongs to the Bishops	453
Never forbidden	<i>ib.</i>	Inferior authority of the Courts	<i>ib.</i>
Objection to wafers	<i>ib.</i>	Rule of Catholic liberty	454
The Mixed Chalice original and Catholic	444	Injury of private interpretations	455
		Conclusion	456

APPENDIX No. I. COUNCILS.

Apostolic Canons	457	Laodiceæ	461
Ancyra	458	Carthage, III.	462
Antioch	459	Bracara, III.	<i>ib.</i>
Nicæa, First General	460	Constantinople in Trullo	<i>ib.</i>

APPENDIX No. II. LITURGIES.

Clementine	465	S. Chrysostom	470
S. James	466	S. Mark	471
S. Basil	468		

APPENDIX No. III. FATHERS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Clement of Rome 474	Tertullian 489
Ignatius 475	Cyprian 490
Justin Martyr <i>ib.</i>	Eusebius of Cæsarea . .	. 491
Irenæus 478	Cyril of Jerusalem . .	. 494
Athenagoras 483	Ambrose 495
Clement of Alexandria .	. <i>ib.</i>	Augustine 497
Origen 485	Chrysostom 501
INDEX OF NAMES 507

ERRATA.

- Page 2, note o, *for* "No. 1," *read* "No. 3."
„ 9, note l, *for* "No. 2," *read* "No. 3."
„ 15, note z, *for* "No. 4," *read* "No. 3."
„ 21, l. 7, *omit* the comma after "kind."
„ 78, note m, *add*, "App. No. I."
„ 97, l. 12, *for* "are," *read* "were."
„ 107, l. 20, *for* "six," *read* "four."
„ 247, note o, *for* "Valerius," *read* "Valesius."
„ 415, note n, *for* "E. H. iii. 24," *read* "E. H. v. 24."
„ 461, l. 2, *for* τελευταλον, *read* τελευταλου.

SACRIFICE AND PARTICIPATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

CHAPTER I.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

THE Holy Eucharist is universally acknowledged to be not only the principal means of grace, but the highest act of worship, in the Christian Church. It is the divinely ordained "liturgy" of the spiritual Israel;—the Service which, like that of the altar at Jerusalem, unites the many members, scattered in place, to present them before God as one body in Christ^a. Comprehending the prayers and praises and thanksgivings of the Church below, it offers them to God in union with the Sacrifice of His dear Son upon the Cross, of which it is the appointed Remembrance, till He come to translate us to the Church above^b.

When it is disputed whether this Service be itself a "sacrifice," the question turns upon the false definitions introduced in support of the Tridentine Mass. Nothing is more certain than that in the Catholic Church, before the division of East and West, the Holy Eucharist was universally regarded as a Sacrifice. This is its common appellation in the Liturgies and Canons; and no one point of doctrine or discipline is more firmly established by the consent of the Fathers.

6. ^a 1 Cor. x. 17.

^b 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Primarily and principally the term was used of the whole service as "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;"—a phrase still retained in our own Liturgy. In like manner under the Old Testament, the "sacrifice," properly speaking, was the whole act of worship, including the spiritual devotion of the worshipper, and not only the material symbol by which it was presented. "What we call sacrifice," writes S. Augustine, "is but the symbol of the true sacrifice. The visible sacrifice is a sacrament or sacred sign of the invisible^c." The material offerings were called sacrifices, as expressing this true inward sacrifice of the man; and in this secondary sense the Church applied the same word to the visible elements of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The bread and wine were solemnly "offered," before they were partaken of: this liturgical act was termed the "oblation;" and the things offered were called "oblations," "gifts," and "sacrifices." The true intent and meaning of these expressions form a main article in our long controversy with Rome; to reject them altogether would be to cut away from under our feet the whole body of evidence on which we appeal to the primitive Church.

Too much stress has been laid on the rationalistic argument, (of which the atheist poet Lucretius was the author,) that God has no need of sacrifice, and the best offering we can make to Him is ourselves. God has no need [of prayer; nor is there any reason, in the nature of things, why words should be more acceptable to Him than gifts, or any other form of devotion. Neither, perhaps, is it safe to assume that

^c S. August. De Civ. Dei, x. 5. Appendix No. 1.

a sinful man is a more worthy sacrifice than an innocent creature.

The prophets, and the Christian Fathers after their example, used this argument against the gross idea of degenerate Jews and Pagans, who thought to please the Divinity by mere external gifts and sacrifices, as though they could really add to His possessions or enjoyment. They insisted, as S. Augustine does, on the spiritual sacrifice, of which the visible offering was but a symbol; and our Lord Himself extended the argument to those who thought to be heard for their much speaking, or by reckoning up deeds of piety, and thanking God they were not as other men. This was not to repeal or disparage the sacrifices, or the works of the Law, but to infuse into them the proper tone and spirit. In like manner, the Fathers, while employing the same language against Pagan sacrifices, never failed to magnify the Great Sacrifice of the Cross, nor scrupled to offer up the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Church, in commemoration and application of its benefits.

It is the belief of many devout Protestants, that Sacrifice is an Old Testament form of worship, which has been superseded and abolished by the True Sacrifice of the Cross. This question can only be determined by the Scripture itself, to which the next chapter will be devoted. Meantime, it may be observed that this persuasion, however prevalent in modern times, is comparatively of recent origin, and is not supported by any explicit statement of the New Testament itself. The texts usually adduced are citations from the Psalms and the Prophets, which cannot reasonably

be supposed to have any other meaning on the lips of Christ and His Apostles, than when first uttered by the Divine Inspiration. If they did not abrogate Sacrifice for those to whom they were originally spoken, why must they be so taken by those to whom they are repeated?

It is not to be forgotten that Sacrifice is a Divine Institution, and the Law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Surely it is a grievous disparagement of the elder dispensation to set a gulph between it and the younger, as though nothing could come from them to us, and whatever is Jewish must therefore be unchristian. We say that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for in both everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ^d." The Levitical worship was typical of the Sacrifice of the Cross, as Christian worship is commemorative of it. How, then, can Sacrifice in itself be more proper to the one than to the other? The distinction seems to suppose a value in the material offering under the Law, which the prophets expressly protest against. It imagines the victim, sent up in flame from the altar, to be more truly accepted by God than the simpler oblations of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. This is to confound the true relations between the Old and New Testament. It even savours of the Gnostic heresy, that the God of the Jews is not the Holy and Spiritual Father revealed in the Gospel. If it be the same God "who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets," that hath now spoken unto us by His Son, it is strange

^d Art. VII.

to say that a form of worship, which He ordained and accepted once, is unworthy of Him now.

Change and modification follow necessarily on a change in the law of His manifestation^e; but change is not abrogation. The text so often adduced, "there is no more offering for sin," refers only to one form of sacrifice, the latest and most peculiar rite of the Levitical dispensation. The abrogation of the Sin-offering, or rather its fulfilment in the Sacrifice of the Cross, by no means supersedes all other forms of sacrifice. On the contrary, the New Testament itself insists on sacrifices of alms, sacrifices of praise, and the sacrifice of body, soul, and spirit; all which the ancient Church, like our own Liturgy, included in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The universal prevalence of these forms of speech and worship in the first ages of the Church, when the language of the New Testament was her vernacular tongue, and altars both Jewish and Gentile were still daily reeking with blood, is proof that they were not then felt to be inconsistent with the one full perfect and sufficient Sacrifice of the Cross.

It has been argued that the Greek word for sacrifice requires a living victim^f, and that inanimate offerings are distinguished by the lesser name of oblations. The distinction, however, is not observed in Scripture, or in the literature of the early Church. The Hebrew *zebach*, it is true, denotes a slain victim,

זָבַח

^e Heb. vii. 12.

^f *θυσία γὰρ κυρίως παρὰ τὸ θύεσθαι ὃ ἐστὶ θυμιάσθαι.*—Theophylact in Heb. viii. Etymology, however, is no rule against usage, even if patristic philology could be relied upon.

and *mincha* (gift) is the regular Levitical word for an offering of flour or bread. When these are opposed to each other, they are translated, "sacrifice and offering^s." In the earlier and more general usage, when no such contrast is in view, the two words are used interchangeably. The offerings of Cain and Abel are both called "sacrifices," and the animal sacrifices of the law are denominated "oblations^h." The Greek Liturgies apply the terms with like indifference to the Holy Eucharist, and the Latin fathers followed the example with their own words *sacrificium* and *oblatio*.

We do not find in Scripture that sacrifice requires of necessity the use of an altar, or fire. Neither appears in the two great examples of the Old and New Testaments,—the Passover and the Cross. What was really requisite was the entire consumption of the offering, in the act of worship; the mode of consuming it depended on the law of the particular sacrifice.

The opinion that Sacrifice is a rite of the Old Testament, inconsistent with the spiritual worship of the Evangelical Dispensation, is historically a greater novelty than any that was sanctioned by the Council of Trent. There is no trace of it before the controversies occasioned by the protest against the sacrifice of the Mass; it is unknown in the Eastern Church to the present day. The Fathers had so little suspicion of it that they almost unanimously interpret Malachi's prophecy

^s Ps. xl. 6; Heb. x. 5, *θυσία καὶ προσφορά*.

^h Gen. iv. 3—5; Heb. xi. 4; Acts xxi. 26. *Mincha* is used of animal sacrifice in 1 Sam. ii. 17; xxvi. 19; Mal. i. 13. In Lev. ii. 2, and other places, where it signifies an inanimate offering, the LXX. has *θυσία*. In Heb. x. 10 *προσφορά* probably refers to the *action* of offering, but in Acts xxi. 26 it clearly includes the *lamb* (Num. vi. 14).

of a pure offering (*mincha, θυσία*), of the Holy Eucharist; and Justin Martyr, who embraced the Gospel about thirty years after the death of S. John, had no doubt that the leper's bread-offering was a type of it. These interpretations may be right or wrong, but they were certainly consistent with the doctrine of the age immediately following the Apostles, and it is too much to believe that the whole Church had gone back to the bondage of the law, in the very springtide of the liberty wherewith Christ had made her free.

To the objection that the Eucharist is nowhere called a sacrifice in the New Testament, it must be said that the early Church thought otherwise; certainly it is not there called a *sacrament*. The two words are closely allied, and S. Augustine, (from whose language they come,) regarded them as of nearly equivalent meaning. With him a sacrament was the sign of a sacrifice, and sacrifice was the reality of a sacrament. Surely we are not called upon to dispute with Greek and Latin writers the meaning of their own language. Such objections may be pressed further than we like. It has been urged that "Jesus Christ never uses the word sacrifice of His own life or death¹," we are not prepared, however, to surrender either the word or the idea to such precarious and negative criticism.

The name of Sacrifice continued without question, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, down to the Reformation, and for some time after. Waterland affirms that "it was the language of the whole Refor-

¹ Jowett on the Epistles, ii. 556.

mation for sixty or seventy years^j." Cranmer and Ridley accepted it without scruple; and Beza, whom Waterland cites as a specimen of the early foreign Reformers, defined the rite to be a sacrifice in three respects: 1. as the offering of a solemn act of praise; 2. as carrying with it an offering of alms; and 3. because the sacrifice of the Lord's death is in a manner set before our eyes in the mysteries, and as it were renewed (*veluti renovetur*)^k.

The first to argue against sacrifice, as one of the expired shadows of the Law, were Luther and Calvin. The former, being entangled in the Romish error of the Corporal Presence, saw no other escape from the sacrifice of the Mass. He was the author of the fallacy, often since repeated, that we cannot be said to sacrifice what we eat ourselves; whereas the greater part of the Levitical sacrifices were actually so consumed by the priests and people. S. Augustine says, that to "eat bread is the sacrifice of Christians in

^j "Christian Sacrifice Explained," Bp. of London's Edition, p. 428. He mentions Dr. Grabe and Pfaff among Lutherans; Beza, Amandus Polanus, Scharpius and Albertinus among Calvinists. The author of "Janus on the Pope and Council," (1869,) observes that "Luther and Melancthon could not, or would not, comprehend the idea of the New Testament priesthood and Eucharistic sacrifice, because both to their minds assumed only the shape to which they had been perverted and degraded, of a domination over the laity, and a systematic traffic in masses," (p. 370). It is a pity that the same prejudice should still close the eyes of some who have not Luther's and Calvin's excuse. The learned Lutheran, C. M. Pfaff, candidly acknowledges that "to say the ancients, by oblation and sacrifice, meant nothing but prayers, would be utterly ridiculous, and display a mind either dissembling or impervious to the truth, or else wholly void of any tincture of ecclesiastical antiquity."—*S. P. Irenæi, Script. Anecd.*, i. 50 (Leyden, 1743).

^k Waterland, p. 428.

the New Testament¹," and S. Chrysostom makes it a point of Christian privilege that priest and people now eat the same sacrifices without distinction^m. One of the greatest corruptions of the Mass is, the *not* eating of the sacrifice.

It is not surprising that, in the outburst of a righteous indignation against an intolerable abuse, the Reformers should be betrayed into some assertions which fail to bear the test of a calmer scrutiny; and this danger was all the greater when the protest was raised by individual champions, instead of by the National Church, as in our own country.

Luther's view of the legal character of sacrifice was espoused by the other great leader of the continental Reformation. Differing widely from Luther's doctrine of the Presence, Calvin was equally anxious to break with the liturgical forms of the Mass. In constituting a new Church worship, he wished it to be as different from the Roman as was compatible with the name of Christianity. Without blaming the Fathers, he regrets that they approached too near to Jewish notions. "Now that the sacrifice has been offered, (he says), God gives us a table where we may feast, not an altar on which the victim is to be offered. He has not consecrated priests to immolate, but ministers to distribute the sacred repastⁿ."

The notions here combated are not Jewish, but Tridentine. In the Jewish (i.e. the scriptural,) rite, the victim was not slain on the altar, nor by the

¹ De Civ. Dei, xvii. 5; App., No. 2.

^m In Epist. ad 2 Cor. Hom. xviii. App. No. 3.

ⁿ Inst. IV., xviii. 1, 12. See Bp. Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles.

priest. In that respect the worshipper offered his own sacrifice. The altar was the Lord's Table^o, on which the dead body was exhibited for food; and the priest's office was to distribute it^p.

Calvin took his notion of sacrifice from the definitions invented by Bellarmine in the cause of the Mass^q. In order to make the Mass "a true and proper sacrifice," the Cardinal pronounced spiritual and symbolical sacrifice to be "improper," and only metaphorically so called. It was easy to reply that, according to this very distinction, the Cross is the only true and proper sacrifice, and the Mass itself "improper;" and this was too often the line of Protestant controversialists. It would have been more scriptural to shew that the Romish distinction is false and misleading.

Spiritual sacrifice is so far from being figurative or metaphorical, that the material is only a symbol and figure of the spiritual. All the sacrifices of the Old Testament were at once spiritual and symbolical: spiritual, as expressing the sacrifice of body, soul and spirit, which the Apostle calls "our reasonable service^r;" and symbolical, as referring (more or

^o Mal. i. 7.

^p The oblations consumed in the fire were the Lord's food (Lev. iii. 11; xxi. 17); the remaining portions the food of the priest and people. The greater Sin-offering, which alone was excepted from this rule, never came upon the altar at all.

^q See Waterland's "Christian Sacrifice Explained," Bp. of London's Ed., 1868, p. 419: "Here began all the subtilities and thorny perplexities which have darkened the subject ever since, and which must, I conceive, be thrown off (together with the new and false definitions which came in with them), if ever we hope to clear the subject effectually, and to set it upon its true and ancient basis."

^r Rom. xii. 1.

less consciously,) to the Sacrifice of Christ, apart from which no service of sinful man can find acceptance with God. This was the law of the Old Testament no less than the New. If the Jew shewed a disposition to rest in the outward rite, he was reminded by prophets and psalmists of the necessity of inward and spiritual worship. The material gift was rejected with scorn, and the broken spirit was demanded as the sacrifice of God^a. Our Lord and His Apostles repeat and enforce these requisitions in the New Testament; they are no new commandment, but the "old commandment which they had from the beginning." Not that visible worship, or material sacrifice, are unacceptable to God, for He Himself appointed them to be offered; but that such signs are hypocritical and odious when devoid of the devout self-surrender which they properly imply.

It was a great injury to the Protestant argument to be diverted from the scriptural and patristic ground, into the tortuous and disingenuous distinctions of the champions of the Mass. The first of our own divines to adopt the new language was Hooker, with whom, as with others of his age, Calvin was a great authority; and Waterland rebukes him severely for the innovation^b.

^a Ps. li. 16, 17.

^b E. P., v. lxxviii. 2. Waterland writes, "Mr. Hooker feared not to say that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, and that we have properly now no sacrifice. I presume he meant by 'proper' sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the sense of the Trent Council, or of the new definitions. . . But I commend not the use of such language, be the meaning ever so right: the Fathers never used it." He goes on to notice "how by degrees Protestant Divines came to leave off calling the Eucharist a sacrifice, or called it so with the epithet of

In reality, nothing turned out more to the support of the Mass, than the ultra-protestant denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Romish controversialists are as ready as others to throw away their distinctions when the purpose is served. Having led their opponents into a general denial, they turned round upon them with the unanimous voice of the early Church, not without support (as we shall see) from the Scripture itself, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and so concluded for the Mass. It is time to deprive them of the benefit of this artifice, and the Church of England is the Communion on which, by her own acknowledgment, the duty is most conspicuously cast. She claims to be a genuine branch of the Church Catholic, appealing before Christendom to the best ages of antiquity. For private persons to put their own construction upon antiquity, and then pretend that such is the mind of our Church, against her plain utterance, or the not less significant silence of her formularies, is justly resented as injurious to her authority as a Church. But is it less disloyal to despise

‘improper,’ or ‘figurative.’ It was chiefly owing to a partial conception of it; they considered it barely in its representative or relative view, and too hastily concluded that since it was not the sacrifice represented, (as the Romanists pretended it was,) it was no sacrifice at all in propriety of speech,” (p. 435). One of the oldest in the use of this ultra-Protestant language was the eccentric convert, Mark Antony de Dominis, who, beginning in the Greek Church, obtained the insignificant archbishopric of Spalato from the Pope; then coming to England, he got the deanery of Windsor from James I.; and returned to die at Rome, where he was afterwards burnt for a heretic. A sort of fashion had set in, which all good Protestants were expected to follow; “and so the vogue ran, and so it has been transmitted through many hands down to this day.”—*Waterland*, 437.

the appeal to Catholic antiquity altogether, and insist on each man's private judgment of the Scripture?

The corruptions of the Church of Rome can never be successfully resisted on theories historically later than themselves. We must go back to an earlier and purer age. The Church of England never consented to make her a present of the name and heritage of the Catholic Church.

"Before all things," she protests, "this Supper must be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done; as His holy Apostles used it; and the good fathers in the primitive Church frequented it."

This is her challenge in the face of Christendom, and no true Anglican need shrink from it.

The Homily proceeds to specify Cyprian and Ambrose, the two Fathers who most emphatically upheld the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and when it adds a caution,—

"lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion it be made a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive,"—

the protest is levelled at the abuses of non-communicating worship, the denial of the cup, and the masses for the dead. This is no more to disown the true sacrifice, than God disowned His own command, when He said, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice."

In the same spirit "the practice of the primitive Church," is united with "the rules of the Scriptures," in the thirtieth Canon, as the ground of the observations there commended to "all the true mem-

^a Hom. xxvii., Of the Worthy Receiving, &c.

bers of the Church of England." "The abuse of a thing, (it is urged,) doth not take away the lawful use of it;" and reference is made to Jewel's Apology, and the whole course of the Anglican Reformation, in support of a principle, which is notoriously the foundation of the Book of Common Prayer.

The divines who have adhered to the ancient view of sacrifice, are not only among the most learned of our Church, but the most formidable opponents of the Romish Mass. If there be too much reason to fear that an exploded teaching is now again being revived among us, the remedy will be found in clearing and indicating the ancient doctrine. It is time to end a strife about words, which serves to divide those who are perhaps more nearly agreed than they suppose, and to encourage the errors we wish to refute. We need not be afraid to look Scripture and the early Church fairly in the face. Without clinging to the grooves of antiquated polemics, we may freely exercise a dispassionate discrimination on the stores they have brought to our hand. All agree that the Eucharist was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." It is the Remembrance and Participation of the One true, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice for the sins of the world. As a partaking, it is a communion; as the Remembrance or memorial, it is in the old language a "sacrifice," i.e. a symbolical act of worship. The Eucharistic action symbolizes at once the atoning Sacrifice of Christ, and the spiritual sacrifice of the Church bought with His Blood;—the Body sacrificed, and the Body mys-

tical^x. In placing the symbols on the Holy Table, we present before God the price of our redemption, and the Israel for whom it was paid^y. This the Fathers called a Sacrifice, "not another sacrifice, (writes S. Chrysostom,) but the same" with that of the Cross; not by iteration, but by remembrance, "we celebrate the Memorial of the Sacrifice^z."

So Cranmer, the first and greatest Reformer of the English Church, had no scruple in translating from the earlier schoolmen^a:—

"The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass, is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people, (for that was done but once by Himself on the Cross,) but it is so called because it is a Memory and Representation of the very true Sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the Cross^b."

^x Comp. i. Cor. x. 17. S. Augustine often insists on this feature of the oblation, as representing the spiritual sacrifice of the Church; see also the sacrificial terms, *λειτουργία*, *ιερογούργια*, and *προσφορά* in Rom. xv. 16. The schoolmen were not unmindful of it, "duplex est res hujus sacramenti," (but with an arbitrary distinction characteristic of the age,) "una quidem quæ est significata *et contenta*, scilicet ipse Christus; alia autem est significata *et non contenta*, scilicet corpus Christi mysticum quod est societas sanctorum." (Summ. Theol., p. iii. qu. 80.) There is clearly no reason why the natural Body should be "contained" in the symbols, more than the mystical, nor why "ipse Christus" should be substituted for "corpus et sanguis Christi," the things really signified.

^y This is the entire force and meaning of every liturgical oblation, sacerdotal and lay, whether under the Law or the Gospel.

^z In Heb. x., Hom. xvii.; so Theophylact, App. No. 4.

^a Lomb. iv., Dist. 12; and so Aquinas, Summ. Theol. 83. 1. App. No. 5.

^b Collier, E. H., p. ii. bk. iv. p. 243.

CHAPTER II.

SACRIFICE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

SACRIFICE is the first act of worship recorded in the Bible, and it is prominent in the celestial visions which so remarkably connect the close of revelation with the beginning^a. There is no reason to doubt that it was instituted at the fall of man, as the sacrament of the covenant of redemption by the Seed of the woman, and was always the appointed type of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world^b." This is the most obvious explanation of the faith by which "Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain^c." In this view, the skins of the victims might be the first "garments of salvation;" serving to impute or communicate the sacrifice, before the grant of animal food was made^d. The sacrifice, properly speaking, was the whole act of worship; its substance was the religious devotion of the worshippers: but the name is also given to the material gift by which it was expressed.

In this first sacrifice we read of neither altar, fire,

^a Comp. Gen. ii. 8, 9 with Rev. xxii. 1—3; and Bp. Horne's Sermons.

^b Rev. xiii. 8; S. Aug. de D. C., xv. 16; Eusebius, D. E., i. 10; Bp. Butler, Anal. ii. 5.

^c Heb. xi. 4.

^d Isa. lxi. 10; comp. Ps. cxxxii. 9, 16; 2 Cor. v. 4; Gal. iii. 27. The skin of the burnt-offering was allotted to the priest in the Levitical law, (Lev. vii. 8); of the peace-offering, to the worshipper. If Adam acted as priest in the family sacrifices, (Bp. Wordsworth, Comm. *in loc.*,) he would declare the law which Cain in his will-worship transgressed.

nor priest; all that is written, is that God had respect (1) to Abel, and (2) to his offering; i.e. in S. Augustine's phrase, first to the invisible sacrifice, and secondly to the visible sign prescribed for its oblation. The Hebrew word *mincha* (gift) is used both of the animal and vegetable offering, and the Apostle (in accordance with the Septuagint) reads of both *θυσία* (sacrifice) and *δῶπα* (gifts) ^e. If the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice was signified by fire, as in after cases^f, it might answer to the Burnt-offering of the Levitical code.

Such was certainly the character of Noah's sacrifice, which stands (like the first) in the front of a new dispensation, and is expressly connected with a covenant of grace. Here we find the altar, the distinction of clean animals, and the "sweet savour" which is the standing phrase for the Divine acceptance^g. It should be observed that the Hebrew *'olāh*, though rendered in all the versions by words denoting consumption by fire, has no such reference in itself.

הֵלֵךְ
רִיחַ

^e The plural has been thought to indicate a separate treatment of the fat, as in later sacrifices; it may as probably denote the cakes or meal that accompanied them. The fact, however, is that each of the brothers offered more things than one. The Eucharistic elements are termed "gifts" in the Greek Liturgies.

^f Judges vi. 21; 1 Kings xviii. 38.

^g Gen. viii. 20, 21. The "altar" was nothing more than the Lord's Table (Mal. i. 12); at first, like the worshipper's own table, a clean piece of ground, or a convenient slab of rock; afterwards an artificial structure. The elevation is a natural expression of thought, akin to worshipping on high places. The Jewish altar retained to the last a *memento* of its original in being a hollow casing, filled with *earth*. (Exod. xx. 24.) The distinction of clean and unclean before the grant of animal food could only relate to sacrifice.

It comes from a root signifying 'to ascend,' and relates not so much to the burning, as to the consequent ascent of the lighter particles towards heaven. The fire was merely the instrument for disengaging the choicer products which "went up" from the altar, leaving nothing but ashes behind. This deeply significant rite formed the basis of the patriarchal worship. No special mention of the *blood* occurs before Moses, but the idea of expiation was undoubtedly included in the sacrifice, and there are distinct allusions to the need of a mediator and intercessor for the transgressor^h. The victim represented the offerer; he gave its life in ransom of his own, and the "going up" of the sacrifice from the altar, was a symbol of the renewed devotion of the reconciled spirit to God.

The Burnt-offering was early supplemented by Peace-offeringsⁱ, a class of sacrifice in which the oblation was divided between the altar, the priest, and the worshipper^k. By eating of the victim they were made "partakers with the altar;" they "did eat and drink with God," implying the most assured reconciliation and acceptance^l. In both kinds of sacrifice the oblation consisted of the prime articles of human food, symbolizing the dependence of man's

^h Gen. xx. 7; Job i. 5; xlii. 8.

ⁱ *Zebach shelemim korban*; LXX. *θυσία σωτηρίου δῶρα*, sacrifices of salvation.

^k Gen. xxxi. 54; Exod. xviii. 12; xxiv. 11. If Abraham's sacrifice (Gen. xv. 10) were a peace-offering, this sort of sacrifice may have marked the inauguration of a covenant of friendship with God; comp. 2 Chron. xx. 7. Similar common feasts accompanied the Homeric sacrifices and those of heathenism generally, 1 Cor. x. 20.

^l Exod. xxiv. 11, (Bp. Wordsworth's Comm.)

life upon God, and the entire consecration of the person to His service. At first, when no flesh was eaten but what was clean for sacrifice, every meal was a Peace-offering, and the daily bread a sacrament^m. To this class (though in some respects unique) belonged the Passover, the first sacrifice which exhibits a special treatment of the blood;—the sacrament of the Mosaic covenant, and the cradle of the Holy Eucharist.

These rites received fuller illustration from the elaborate ritual of the Levitical law. The Burnt-offering, without ceasing to be offered, as of old, on special occasions and for particular persons, was made a “continual sacrifice” for all Israel. Morning and evening every day the lamb was renewed on the altar, and left slowly burning through the intervening hours. Its smoke ascended without ceasing, the fire was never to go outⁿ. To this continuous sacrifice all the offerings presented on the altar were united, and “went up” with it in the flame. It was the central root of acceptance to every other service, and various provisions existed for communicating its benefits. Every Burnt-sacrifice was accompanied by its proper meat and drink-offering^o. The meat-offering (*mincha*) was an oblation of fine flour, of which the priest cast a handful with incense and oil on the altar, to be consumed with the Burnt-sacrifice; the remainder being eaten by the

77013

^m Levit. xvii. 1—4. The list of animals allowed for food in Levit. xi., much exceeds the few that were clean for sacrifice. These were confined to oxen, sheep, goats, and pigeons,—the oldest of chattels, and the first articles of animal food.

ⁿ Exod. xxix. 38—42; Levit. vi. 9, 13.

^o Numb. xv. 4, 5.

priests in the holy place^p. This handful is called the "memorial" (*azkarah*) ; its office was first to *represent* the entire offering on the altar, and next to *communicate* to the remainder the acceptance acquired by its association with the holocaust. Hence the portion eaten by the priests, though never actually on the altar, is called "a thing most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire." S. Chrysostom refers to this sacrifice, when he reminds the Christian that he is privileged to eat in the Holy Eucharist the same thing with the priest.

הַזֶּכֶּרֶת The same word (*azkarah*) is used of the incense, which served, in like manner, to connect the Burnt-offering with the shew-bread in the sanctuary. The twelve loaves which lay on the golden table before the vail, representing the twelve tribes before the face of God^q, were changed every sabbath; the incense that stood upon them in two golden vials or cups was cast upon the altar, and the priests were to eat the old loaves in the sanctuary, like a meat-offering. These Memorial sacrifices provided for the priests a daily communion with the Burnt-sacrifice, and a further weekly communion of the shew-bread, thus brought into union with the altar.

^p It would seem from this chapter, Levit. ii., that the mincha might be, and was at times, offered as an independent sacrifice. The use of the drink-offering (*nesek*), is not given, but it would seem from Exod. xxx. 9 that it was poured upon the burnt sacrifice, each lamb requiring about a quart. See note on p. 21.

^q Much has been written of the shew-bread, but this seems at once the simplest and most natural explanation. The Scripture is silent on the manner of putting the incense on the loaves, and on its disposal when they were changed. Josephus supplies the vials, (Ant. iii. 6, 6,) and the name *azkarah* suggests that, like other memorials, it was cast on the altar of burnt sacrifice. (See Speaker's Commentary *in loc.*)

The Peace-offering extended the communion to the laity. Being offered in varying numbers at the stated festivals, and on any other occasion of private or public devotion, it formed by far the most numerous class of sacrifice under the law. The Peace-offering had its meat and drink-offering like the Burnt-sacrifice, and those of the eucharistic kind^r, included, besides the usual meat-offering for the priests, cakes of leavened and unleavened bread, which were given back to the consumption of the worshipper, after one of each kind had been heaved before the altar by way of memorial. It would seem, too, that the "remnant" of the drink-offering (which was often too much to be disposed of as a libation on the altar) must have been added to the sacrificial feast^s.

^r Levit. vii. 12. *zebach-ha-toda*; LXX. *θυσία τῆς αἰδέσεως*, sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving. Comp. Heb. xiii. 15.

^s The proportion of the drink-offering was a quarter of a *hin* to a lamb, a third to a ram, and a half to a bullock. Josephus is supposed to make the *hin* nearly a gallon and a half English measure, but the Rabbins reduce it to half that quantity, (*Bibl. Dict., Weights and Measures*). The victims appointed for the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, (Numb. xxix. 13—15,) would require a drink-offering of forty-six gallons at the lower calculation. Solomon's sacrifice at the dedication of the Temple, (2 Chron. vii. 5,) would require 32,000 gallons, and, if Josephus is rightly understood, twice as much. It is certain that wine was drunk at the sacrificial feasts, (1 Chron. xxix. 22,) and the cup of salvation (Ps. cxvi. 13) is plainly connected with the sacrifice of thanksgiving, (v. 17.) Hengstenberg, indeed, affirms the use of the cup in the Jewish Festival to be a mere fiction, but the Psalm is so understood by Mede and many good modern commentators. Certainly the priests did not consume the drink-offerings, (as might be supposed from a passage in the Introduction to Leviticus in the Speaker's Commentary). Levit. x. 9. They may have shared them before the sin of Nathan and Abihu, which the Palestine Targum understands to have been intoxica-

That the Memorial was designed for a remembrance to God, rather than man, is apparent from its presentation on the altar to "go up" with the holocaust. This is confirmed by the full expression, "a sacrifice of memorial, bringing to remembrance¹." For of the parties in this case before the altar, one was ignorant of the fact, and the other suspected of concealing it; wherefore God, to whom it was certainly known, was invoked to remember and divulge the truth.

In the case of the animal victims, the office of the Memorial was discharged by a choice portion, which was burned on the altar, and going up with the Burnt-sacrifice is expressly called "the food of the Lord²." Another portion, after being waved before the altar, belonged to the priests; and the remainder of the flesh was to be eaten by the worshipper and his friends, during the prescribed period of the solemnity. This eating was so indispensable a condition, that if not performed within the appointed time, the offender was to "bear his iniquity³." The benefit was imputed only to such as partook of the sacrifice by actual eating, in the manner prescribed by the law.

The Passover (as has been said) was undoubtedly a Peace-offering, for though little is recorded of its ritual in Egypt, it followed in the Temple the regular

tion, and their portion may then have been transferred to the people, whose greater numbers would be a protection against intemperance.

¹ Numb. v. 15. *Mincha zikaron maskeret avon*, θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμνήσκουσα ἀμαρτίαν, LXX. In this case it was iniquity, not piety, that was to be brought to the divine remembrance; hence the oil and frankincense are excluded from the memorial (cf. Lev. v. 11, 12), and there was no "sweet savour" to the Lord. Compare Phil. iv. 18.

² Lev. iii. 11, 16.

³ Lev. vii. 18.

law of the Peace-offering. A lamb was slain, and the usual parts burned on the altar, while the remainder was eaten by the worshippers; no portion, perhaps, was reserved for the priests, since they had their own passover to offer and to eat. Hence the unleavened bread and wine of which our Lord and His disciples partook at the Last Supper, no less than the lamb, may have been previously offered by their respective "memorials," and were so connected with the Burnt-sacrifice then slowly burning on the altar. It was doubtless from the frequent participation with the altar enjoyed in these sacrifices, that the phrase "eating and drinking" came to be used of the reception of spiritual graces;—a figure naturally suggested by the use of those actions in religious rites, but otherwise not easy to explain⁷.

To these developments of the elder worship the Levitical ritual added a sacrifice peculiar to itself, in order to bring out in greater prominence the functions of atonement and mediation. This was the *Sin-offering*⁸, distinguished by a peculiar treatment of the *flesh* and *blood* of the victim. The blood is declared to be the life or soul of the flesh, and for that reason was ordained on the altar, to make atonement for souls⁹. The same reason being given for

⁷ Waterland observes that "eating and drinking, by a very easy, common figure, means receiving;" citing 1 Cor. xi. 29, where eating and drinking damnation means receiving damnation, (p. 92). But the receiving is there connected with a literal eating and drinking; and I do not see how in any case the figure should have arisen, except from the well-known connexion of spiritual consequences with actual eating and drinking.

⁸ *Chatûth*; LXX., *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (Lev. vi. 25).

⁹ Levit. xvii. 11. "For the soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I

the prohibition of blood as food^b; this was probably the law of sacrifice from the first, and may have been expressed by some treatment of the blood which has not been recorded. At the first Passover the blood was sprinkled on the posts and lintel of the house, to protect the inhabitants from the angel of destruction. It attested the death of the lamb within; i.e. the life taken in lieu of the life forfeited under the general decree.

No other use is apparent in the treatment of the blood of the Burnt-offerings and Peace-offerings of the law. In all these sacrifices the flesh and the blood appeared on the altar separately and apart. The priest's offering commenced after they had been severed in death; with the living victim he had simply to determine its fitness for the sacrifice. It was offered by the worshipper himself; he laid his hands upon it, slew it, divided it, and then filled the priest's hands with the pieces to be presented on the altar. In like manner the priest received the blood after its escape from the flesh, and cast it separately on the altar^c. No part

have ordained it for you upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls; for the blood it is which makes atonement by means of the soul." (Speaker's Commentary, *in loco*.) Perhaps too much has been made of the scientific connexion of the blood with the life in the living creature. The ritual deals with the blood *shed*, and seems to treat it simply as the natural evidence of death.

^b Gen. ix. 4.

^c The translation, "sprinkle round about," is allowed to be erroneous. The blood was certainly cast from a bason in a more copious volume; but on what part of the altar? The general explanation, that it was dashed against the side or wall, is open to the objection that it would flow down on the place where the priests stood to officiate. This seems strangely inconvenient, besides not coming up to the force of the words, "upon the altar." The better explanation seems to be that the blood

of it went up in the flame, and none was returned either to priest or layman for consumption. It supplied no food to God or man, but merely presented the death,—the blood *shed*, the life taken,—and then disappeared into the bosom of the earth. The “atone-ment” was the offering before God of the *death* of the victim by the hands of His priest.

In the covenant of Mount Sinai a further use of the blood was introduced, to which the Apostle attaches much significance. Moses sprinkled one half on the altar, and the other half on the people, calling it the blood of the covenant^d. The Apostle (who joins water with the blood), expounds it as a rite of *purification*. A similar use of blood occurs in the consecration of the priests^e, and constitutes the leading idea of the Sin-offering. Of this sacrifice there were two forms, according to the private or public station of the transgressor. In both cases the first oblation, the laying on of hands, the slaying and dividing for the altar, were the same as in other sacrifices. Instead, however, of casting the blood on the altar, the priest, in the lower form, put some of it with his finger on

was cast on the *top* of the altar, in a groove or gutter that ran along the outer edge, and communicated at the corners with pipes leading to the drains below. In this way the blood would appear on the altar, still separate from the flesh, as the proper witness of the victim's death.

^d Comp. Exod. xxiv. 6—8; Heb. ix. 19. The Hebrew has the same word as in the last note. But the Apostle's mention of the hyssop, and the Greek word *παντίζω*, suggest sprinkling rather than casting. Perhaps the blood was “cast” on the altar, and “sprinkled” with the hyssop on the people and the book. The water may here be restricted to the people; Josephus *seems* to suggest it was used separately after the blood.—(Ant. III. xi. 1.)

^e Levit. viii. 24.

the horns of the altar, and poured away the remainder into the cavities at its base. Neither meat nor drink-offering was permitted; but the flesh of the victim was eaten by the priests in the holy place^f.

The more solemn form of Sin-offering, used for the high-priest or the congregation, could be celebrated by no inferior priest. The high-priest (or his deputy) carried the blood into the holy place, and sprinkled it with his finger seven times before the vail^g; some he put on the horns of the golden altar, and poured the remainder away (as before) at the base of the altar of sacrifice. Once a-year, on the great day of atonement, he passed within the vail, and sprinkled the blood upon or before the mercy-seat itself^h; while a cloud of incense rose from the golden censer, to hide the Divine glory from his sight. The flesh of the victim was carried out and burned to ashes beyond the city wallsⁱ.

This annual day of atonement served as a kind of

^f See the exception, however, in Levit. v. 11, where the victim itself left nothing to be eaten by the priests.

^g Levit. iv. 6. Perhaps on the floor; not, as the Vulgate would suggest, on the vail itself. The object of putting the blood on the horns of the altar seems to have been to lift it more conspicuously before God; and as the two altars were in a direct line from the mercy-seat, they formed a gradation of access proportioned to the character of the sacrifice.

^h Levit. xvi. 14. The commentators generally understand that the blood was sprinkled first on the front or eastern face of the ark, and then on the floor before it. Josephus, who was a priest, says it was sprinkled seven times on the ceiling, as also on the pavement, and again as often towards the most holy place, by which he must here mean the ark. The Jewish writers generally deny that the blood actually touched the mercy-seat itself.

ⁱ Levit. vi. 30; comp. Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

recapitulation of the several atoning rites of the year, —gathering all up into one comprehensive act, from which they derived their character, as our weekly Fridays do from the anniversary of the crucifixion^k. On this occasion the high-priest anointed not only the horns of the golden altar with the blood, but those of the altar of sacrifice, and perhaps all the sacred implements^l. This was to purify them from the uncleanness, so inherent to sinful man as to attach even to his means of communication with God. There is uncleanness in the most sacred things of a holy people: even the mercy-seat of God needs to be reconciled to His holiness, after intercourse with men. Of purification, however, *water* is the natural and scriptural symbol; the use of *blood* (which naturally is polluting), implies an imputation of the sacrifice accepted in expiation.

The blood thus presented within the vail was the “remembrance” of the Sin-offering^m; serving, like the Memorial of the *mincha*, to bring it before God, and to impute its acceptance to all that was touched by it. For this highest rite of the Levitical ritual, the high-priest laid aside his golden garments, and clad in spotless white passed into the awful Presence, with no one to accompany or beholdⁿ. Alone he entered, separated for the moment from the throng of sinners without, and when he came back all sin was left behind, as he gave the blessing of Jehovah *urbi et orbi*^o.

^k The trespass-offering (*asham*) was a kind of sin-offering distinguished by a pecuniary fine, implying the necessity of *restitution*.

^l Heb. ix. 21, 22.

^m Heb. x. 3.

ⁿ Levit. xvi. 17.

^o Levit. ix. 22: comp. Numb. vi. 23—26; Acts iii. 26; Heb. ix. 28.

No liturgical act was ever more grand or impressive. At the same time, it was strictly liturgical and ceremonial. The whole was minutely prescribed by the law; nothing whatever is attributed to the individual priest,—everything to his office and acts. It is a ceremony, too, of dumb show, for the prayers which gave voice to the ritual were uttered by the people without.

So, too, with the sacrifices; they were properly “offered,” not (as is often supposed) by the priests, but by the people themselves, who are constantly called the sacrificers^p. Nothing in the word “priest,” or in the scriptural word which it represents, has any necessary connexion with sacrifice. It means simply a “man of God,” or as the Apostle defines it, one “ordained in things pertaining to God^q.” What these things are,—whether prophecy, sacrifice, inter-

^p Levit. vii. 12; xvii. 8; Deut. xviii. 3; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25; 1 Kings viii. 5, &c. These and similar passages have been alleged on the other hand in proof of the non-necessity of the priest; but in a rite embracing a twofold agency, the mention of one properly infers the other. The Hebrew *cohen* is probably derived from a root signifying “nearness,” and is used of royal princes or officers, (2 Sam. viii. 18; xx. 26; 1 Kings iv. 5; Job xii. 19). The modern theories, which imagine some priestly rank to be referred to in these places (Bible Dict.), are purely conjectural, and against the Scripture. In the first of these texts the word is explained by 1 Chron. xviii. 17 to mean, “at the hand of the king;” and the last is reproduced in Ps. cvii. 40, with the substitution of “princes.” In like manner the priests were officers, “at the hand” of the heavenly King. The Greek *ἱερός* (from *ἁγίος*, holy, or consecrated,) is applied in the New Testament to the spiritual Israel as partaking in the sacrifice of Christ, (Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6). Our English word “priest,” abbreviated from *presbyter* (or *elder*), is the only available translation for both, but the proper signification of each is determined by the religious system to which it belongs.

^q Heb. ii. 17; v. 1.

cession, prayer, or benediction,—depends on the particular rite. Under the Levitical law, the worshipper himself offered and slew the victim. His own hand took the life that was to be accepted instead of himself; his own hand shed the blood that was to effect the atonement for his soul; the priest received it from him *dead*, and presented it on the altar as the witness of a sacrifice already made[†]. The eating, too, a no less necessary part of the sacrifice than the oblation, was, in the most numerous class, shared by the lay worshipper. The most distinctive office of the priesthood was to burn incense in the sanctuary; this was the presentation of the sacrifice of prayer offered by the people outside, with an added fragrance, symbolical of an intercession not yet revealed[‡].

The sons of Aaron were not a *caste* like the heathen priests; they were of one blood with the worshippers. They pretended to no private or personal favour with the Deity; they had no esoteric teaching, no secret mysteries, no initiations or privileged rites for the

[†] Hence the expression, “filling the hands,” denotes the priestly consecration, (Levit. viii. 27; xvi. 32). The gifts of the people were made over to the priests *in trust* for the service of the altar; and this act, by which Moses the mediator of the Law consecrated Aaron and his sons in perpetuity, was repeated by the individual at every sacrifice, with the exception of those provided by the priests themselves. See Note on Lev. vi. 20, Speaker’s Commentary.

[‡] Luke i. 10; Rev. viii. 7. From the latter text it is thought the incense and the prayer were offered in *silence*. Incense was burned before the morning sacrifice and after the evening one, daily; its preparation as well as use was restricted to the priests, yet the composition was no secret, but might be read by all in the law, (Exod. xxx. 34). It is never called a sacrifice. In Rev. v. 8 the prayers are the *vials*, not the incense, as shewn by the gender of the relative.

select. The true *caste* was the holy nation, a kingdom of priests. The law of the sacrifices was the law of all Israel. A wall of partition rose indeed between Jew and Gentile, but nothing stood between the Israelite and the altar. The priest was one of themselves,—a family accepted, instead of the eldest sons of the other families, to be the executive of a function naturally inherent in mankind. There was not even a personal selection, not a vestige of special gifts or graces[†]. The priest was strictly a representative of the national priesthood, offering for his own sin before he could offer for another. Such a ministry witnessed, indeed, to the necessity of a mediator between God and man; but the mediation lay in the rite more than the priest. It was Moses, not Aaron, who was the mediator of that covenant, and when Moses was removed, his ritual remained to point to the coming Prophet, and “another Priest[‡].”

A due consideration of the Levitical rites will make it evident that no Israelite, with any worthy conception of the character ascribed in the law to Jehovah, could have thought of offering Him a wor-

[†] The holy oil was simply an outward mark of consecration common to the tabernacle, the altar, and other sacred utensils. It is doubtful whether the ordinary priests received it individually, or were held to be anointed once for all in the persons of Aaron's immediate offspring. The high-priest, emphatically the *anointed* one, no doubt was in this as in other respects a type of the true Christ; but the oil on his head was the symbol of a gift, not to the priests but to the people. It descended on the names of the twelve tribes on his shoulders and breast-plate (Exod. xxviii. 9, 12, 17, 21), and thence to the hem of his garment, in token of the religious unity of the whole body. (Ps. cxxxiii.)

[‡] Heb. vii. 11.

ship hardly equalling what was paid to the gods of the heathen. If such a thought found access for a moment, a voice was heard from the altar itself, "If I were hungry I would not tell thee, for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving: and pay thy vows unto the Most High^x." In the very act of consecrating the Temple he was taught to confess, that God does not indeed dwell on the earth, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him^y. The hypocrite, who should come into His courts with sin in his heart, would be arrested by the stern demand, "Who hath required this at your hands? bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes^z." If any thought to hide his offence in a multitude of sin-offerings, he would be told, "the sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is His delight^a."

The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican was not reserved for the New Testament; it meets us in the middle of the Old. We hear it from the lips of the prophet, pronouncing that He looked to the poor and contrite spirit, and held the highest sacrifice of the self-righteous to be only a pollution of His altar^b. The prayer which came from the penitent's own lips

^x Ps. l. 12.^y 1 Kings viii. 27.^z Isa. i. 12—16.^a Prov. xv. 8.^b Isa. lxvi. 2, 3.

ever asserted its superiority over the dumb ritual of the altar^c. In the Burnt-offering, with its smoke ascending without intermission, and its daily communion for the priests; in the Peace-offering, with its copious round of special services extending the fellowship to the laity; in the Sin-offering, the proper sacrifice of confession and absolution and (when offered in combination) taking precedence of the other two^d;—he would surely recognise the visible signs of an invisible sacrifice. Their very names told of the soul's struggle with sin, its aspirations towards God, its yearning for His peace. The Psalms that gave voice to the oblation uttered nothing but spiritual worship. Had the sacrifice lain in the external worship, the Gospel, instead of being the fulfilment of the law, would have introduced a new religion, and even another God^e.

What has been called the ceremonial or legal efficacy of the sacrifice was really nothing more than the privilege of Church communion. The sons of Aaron could not read the heart, more than the successors of the Apostles. When the Israelite duly obeyed the law of the sacrifice he was accepted, as the Christian is who duly partakes of the Holy Communion. A larger measure of temporal advantage in the one, and of spiritual grace in the other, is the true distinction between the two covenants; as respects the

^c Hosea xiv. 2.

^d Levit. v. 5—10; xvi. 24.

^e "A Hebrew sacrifice, like a Christian Sacrament, possessed the inward and spiritual grace as well as the outward and visible sign. The mere empty form, or the feeling of an *opus operatum*, was as alien to the mind of an enlightened Israelite, who brought his gift to the altar, as it is to the well-instructed Christian who comes to the Table of the Lord."—*Speaker's Commentary*, vol. i. p. 495.

comparative value of visible and invisible sacrifice, the Law and the Gospel speak with one and the same voice. The Hebrew Sacrifice and the Christian Sacrament stand on one level; in both, the sign and the thing signified properly go together, and have, therefore, the same name. Neither ever balances one against the other, to assess their several value; but disowning the separate existence, each exhibits the union, in one indivisible rite, at once of an acceptable offering, and a real communion with God.

The *prophetic* or mystical part of the sacrifice was less clearly revealed under the law. Still, that worship was known from the first to be typical of better things to come^f. The elaborate allegory, unfolded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, was not invented by Jesus Christ or His disciples. They could never have appealed to their countrymen on a new and unauthorized interpretation of the Scriptures. The rulers and priests^g would not have endured such an attempt for a moment. How could any one "prove from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ," if the Scriptures had not all along been known to point to the coming of such a Messiah? It needs but a glance at the writings of Philo and Josephus, or the Targums, to see what was the faith of enlightened Judaism before the rise of Christianity. Jesus Himself took His stand on the fulfilment, not the abolition, of the Law; and the great pupil of Gamaliel never thought of deserting the religion of his fathers, in preaching the Gospel which once he persecuted. What the New Testament did,

^f Exod. xxv. 40; Heb. viii. 5.

^g John iii. 10; Acts vi. 7.

was to centre the inspired traditions of the Old on the Person and work of Jesus of Nazareth. It was not an apostasy, nor a schism, but the pre-ordained growth of the Church of God.

Nothing can be more unscriptural than to set a gulf between the two Dispensations. Our Lord and His Apostles were Jews, born and bred under the law, which He came to fulfil, and which they found to be a schoolmaster to bring them unto Christ. They observed the Levitical rites, in conjunction with the evangelical, till they failed by the removal of the Temple. Their place was taken in the New Jerusalem by answering rites, originated under their wing. The Levitical worship passed into the Christian without solution of continuity. It was the unbelieving synagogue that lost altar, priest, and sacrifice; the Church succeeded to the true enjoyment of all.

If the New Testament were designed to abolish a rite which pervaded the entire worship of the Old, and without which no religion had ever been known to exist, the change would surely have been made by express prohibition, or at least by removing the principle on which Sacrifice was founded. Such a prohibition is not to be assumed from texts of the Old Testament, cited by Jewish writers to the same purport with the prophets, from whom they took them. As for the principle of sacrifice, it has been shewn to be two-fold, first, as an external sign of inward devotion, and secondly, as a symbol of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The first is plainly continued in the Christian Sacraments, which are visible and material signs of grace and worship, ordained by Christ Himself for

perpetual observance in His Church. The other is far more apparent in the New Testament than the Old. We are baptized into the death of Christ, and the Eucharist is the shewing and communicating of that Great Sacrifice.

When the early Church is accused of reverting to the shadows of the law, in continuing to her Sacraments the scriptural name of Sacrifice, it has to be shewn, either that the death of Christ was not in the scriptural sense a true sacrifice, or how the visible rite, ordained for its remembrance, has lost the ancient title. The death of Christ is acknowledged to be the one true Sacrifice, accepted by God for all mankind. We do not explain away the old legal sense of sacrifice to substitute some new and purely spiritual process; but we believe, without a metaphor, that we are really redeemed by the Blood shed on the Cross, and that Christ ever lives in human nature to make intercession for us, in the power of that all-sufficient atonement. That is to say, we believe Him to be our Sacrifice and High-Priest, in the true and highest sense of those words in the Old Testament. So far, at least, sacrifice is not abolished, but perfected in the Gospel.

It remains to be asked why, if Christ be literally and truly our Sacrifice, the means of union with Christ must be so called only in a new and metaphorical signification? The sacrifices of the Law, as expounded in the Gospel, were symbolical representations of the Sacrifice of Christ; ordained to unite the worship of men with that One Eternal Propitiation before God. This is also the exact purport of the Holy Eucharist. That

they were types, and this is a memorial, is merely a difference of time, which cannot be of the essence of sacrifice, since it was equally a rite of Patriarchal and Levitical worship. The material symbols are changed under the Gospel, as they were under the Law, but this is not enough to abolish the nature of sacrifice.

To argue that when the True Sacrifice has been offered, no other can be added, implies that some other was added in the Levitical worship. It suggests that the Old Testament sacrifices were in themselves, apart from the Cross, real and acceptable though imperfect propitiations;—instalments, as it were, in part payment of a debt, which was fully discharged on the Cross, and therefore admits of no further similar payments. This suggestion is utterly false and unscriptural. The Old Testament sacrifices stood, in this respect, on precisely the same footing with the Christian Sacraments. If the Scripture calls them sacrifices, though only relative to the Cross, there can be no impropriety on this account in continuing the same name to the Christian ordinances:—

“By the same rule that theirs was, by the same may ours be, termed a Sacrifice. In rigour of speech neither of them; for (to speak after the exact manner of divinity) there is but one only sacrifice, *veri nominis* properly so called: that is Christ's Death. And that Sacrifice but once actually performed, at His death; but ever before represented, in figure, from the beginning, and ever since repeated in memory, till the world's end. That only absolute, all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. The Lamb but once actually slain in the fulness of time, but virtually was from the beginning, is and shall be to the end of the world. That

the centre in which their lines and ours, their types and our antitype, do meet. While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it in theirs; and after it is passed, the memory of it is still kept fresh in mind, by the commemoration of it in ours. So it was the will of God; that so there might be with them a continual foreshewing, and with us a continual shewing forth, the Lord's death till He come again. Hence it is that what names theirs carried, ours do the like, and the Fathers make no scruple of it, no more need we^b."

Reserving to the next chapter the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, we may here observe that in the visions of the Apocalypse, which conclude the sacred volume, the imagery is still sacrificial. Without mistaking vision for history, it is of deep significance that the Church's acts of faith and devotion, under the Gospel, are there seen to come up for a memorial before God, in the forms of the older worship under the Law. It may be too much to call these "transactions in heaven," but they supply at least some rule for harmonizing the thought of the Church below with the counsels of the Eternal.

There, then, is seen standing in the midst of the throne "a Lamb as it had been slain,"—slain as all the old victims were before their oblation on the altar; but, unlike them endowed with a new life, and standing, not on the altar, but in the midst of the throne,—the Melchisedek of the New Covenant. He has the power and spirit of God. He is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the God-Man, the object of worship

^b Bp. Andrewes, Sermon vii., on the Resurrection.

to heaven and earth. The four-and-twenty crowned elders, (representing probably the patriarchs of the Old and New Testament,) anointed by His blood to be kings and priests unto God, offer Him incense in golden vials, which are the prayers of the saints. They recite the Eucharist of redemption, in which the Angels join, and the four mysterious creatures that support the throne repeat the Amen. Without presuming to define these celestial symbols too closely, we see at once that they are sacrificial: they invest the Old Testament institution with a new and continuous efficacy. They present the Sacrifice of the Cross, as the foundation of the ever-abiding mediation, in which the Blessed Victim lives and reigns King and Priest for ever.

In another vision an angel is seen standing by the golden altar, with a censer full of much incense, which he offers with the prayers of all saints. The incense, as before, is distinguished from the prayers; before it was the vessel that contained them,—here, it is a sweet odour cast upon the prayers by the angel. As this fragrance, of course, can be nothing but the Saviour's merit, some take this angel for Christ, but in presence of created angels close by, the appellation, "another angel," is more obviously understood of one of the celestial hierarchy. The much incense is not his own, but is given to him; and the blood, the peculiar charge of the high-priest, is wanting. This angel, therefore, seems to represent the derived priesthood and intercession of the Church below. He offers the unbloody sacrifice, made not at the great altar of Burnt-offering in the court, but at the golden altar within

the sanctuary, and perfumed with the merits of Christ. Hence the petition in the old Liturgies, that the offerings of the Church might be carried by angels to the altar in heaven. If this interpretation be accepted, the double vision of the Lamb and the angel may denote the twofold offering which constitutes the Eucharistic Sacrifice; the Remembrance of the Lord's death, and the self-oblation of His people. In any case, explain these mysterious visions how we may, it is certain that they represent Christian worship under the forms of sacrifice, not abolished but glorified; and so far they justify the language and conceptions of the early Church.

Both in the Old and New Testament, then, the only sacrifice of absolute inherent virtue is the Sacrifice of the Cross. All others are relative to this one true propitiation and satisfaction for sin, and are effectual only through faith in the covenant sealed in its blood. Sacrifice is simply a symbolical act of worship, differing only in form from vocal prayer and praise. The Old Testament itself classes them in the same category. "Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." And again, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is His delight."

The incense, the manual gesture, the offered gift, the spoken words, are but forms and expressions of spiritual worship. Neither one nor the other could ever have a separate value in Revealed Religion. The form of a gift implies no addition to the Divine pos-

sessions, any more than the form of a verbal address implies an extension of the Divine knowledge. We offer nothing to God that is not already His; we tell Him nothing He does not already know. Yet of His own we may offer in sacrifice, as we make known our requests in prayer, though He understands our thoughts long before. The acknowledgment of His all-sufficiency is the very root both of the sacrifice and the prayer. If we are cautioned against expecting acceptance from the abundance of our gifts, our Lord Himself supplies the like warning against thinking to be heard for our much speaking.

The Scriptures, in short, recognise no essential difference between the two acts of worship. It can never be proved that sacrifice is inconsistent with the spirit of the New Testament, till it has been shewn that words have something in them more evangelical than actions. The New Testament itself, written by Jews, with whom sacrifice was a divine institution, and at a time when no form of religion existed without it, contains no command to renounce symbolical rites, or limit the Christian worship to vocal prayer and song. On the contrary, the range of sacrifice is extended by taking up into it alms and all good deeds, when sanctified by the word of God and prayer. A symbolical rite is ordained for the admission of believers into the Church of Christ, and another for the perpetual Memorial of His death in her highest act of worship. Finally, the entire service of the Church on earth is represented as accepted in heaven under the familiar forms of sacrifice. This is to ex-

pand and elevate, not to supersede the former worship. So at least the Primitive Church thought, when continuing to the Eucharistic action, and in a secondary sense its material symbols, the name given in Scripture to one of its legal types, she made this celebration her great offering of praise and thanksgiving, and called it the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

CHAPTER III.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST.

It is constantly repeated, and constantly forgotten, that the Sacraments of Christ are neither more nor less than He appointed them to be. The Eucharist can never be other, in substance or effect, than it was when He gave it to His disciples the night before He suffered. The ritual varies with the order of the Church, but the Sacrament and the grace are the same. The entire doctrine is comprehended in the Institution of the Founder. The Institution, however, was not absolutely a new and independent rite, but grafted on the chief sacrament of the Mosaic covenant, and ordained to take a similar place in the evangelical kingdom. The significance of this connexion is shewn in its being pressed on a Gentile Church, which had naturally no inheritance in the Jewish Passover. It was not by way of accommodation to Jewish habits of thought, but in very real and universal truth, that the Apostle wrote, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast ^a." Hence the enquiry begins in the observance so perfected into the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The Passover was emphatically the "Lord's Sacrifice ^b," instituted in Egypt before the event it related to, and ever after commemorated (with the exodus it symbolized) in a perpetual ordinance. Though older than the priesthood, the altar and its sacrifices, it

^a 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

^b Exod. xxiii. 18.

readily fell in with the Levitical liturgy, and was observed as a Peace-offering. When our Lord celebrated it with His disciples, the lamb was slain at the altar, and the usual parts offered on the holocaust, together with the proper meat and drink-offering. Being a "sacrifice of thanksgiving," there would be the usual offering of cakes, which at this season were all unleavened. All this formed the preparation for the feast. The Gospel narrative begins with the supper, that followed the oblation in the Temple, and completed the sacrifice. This supper comprised, 1. The flesh of the lamb, which was called "the body of the *pesach*;" in the distribution of it, the master was wont to say, in answer to the interrogation of the youngest person, "this is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt; let him that hath need come and eat the passover, for this passover is our saviour and refuge." 2. Unleavened bread eaten with bitter herbs; of this it was said, "this is the bread of affliction, which our fathers did eat in the land of affliction." 3. Successive cups of wine, not mentioned in the Pentateuch, but named in our Lord's paschal supper; one of these, designated by S. Luke "the cup after supper," was also called "the cup of blessing." The Rabbis further note the actions of taking, blessing, breaking, and the singing a hymn, as included in the Jewish ceremonial^c.

In these particulars the Eucharistic rite exhibits

^c See Lightfoot, Buxtorf, and the Jewish writers quoted in C. M. Pfaff's Dissertations *De Oblatione* and *De Consecratione Veterum Eucharistica*, A.D. 1743, with Bengel, Gnom. New Testament in Matth. xxvi. 26, and the commentators generally.

a striking parallel, with some great and leading differences. The Body of Christ is substituted for the "body of the *pesach*," and the lamb disappears from the feast. The bread succeeds in its place under the denomination of His Body, and a new sacrament of the Blood is added in the cup. The whole is commanded to be done for the remembrance of Christ. There is sameness enough to give the Eucharist the place in the New Covenant, which the Passover had in the Old; and there is change enough to demand the most serious investigation into its significance.

Of the Institution we have three independent narratives, from S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Paul, with a fourth, which S. Luke probably derived from the Apostle. S. Paul's is the fullest, and the most generally followed in the Liturgies, probably as coming from the Risen Lord, after the atoning Sacrifice had been finished, and the Sacrament was to exhibit it in His Church till He come.

He took bread, He gave thanks over it, He blessed it, He brake it, and gave to His disciples, saying, "Take, eat, this is My Body." So far the four accounts are almost verbally the same. S. Luke supplies the important addition "which is given for you." This he appears to have obtained from S. Paul, whose words in our translation are, "which is *broken* for you;" but the best MSS. read simply τὸ ἵπὲρ ὑμῶν,—"*broken*" being supplied from the foregoing word "*brake*." The ancient Liturgies all express this word, with the addition, (taken from the blessing of the cup,) "for the remission of sins," shewing the reference to the *sacrificed* Body. The Roman Canon alone charac-

teristically stops with S. Matthew and S. Mark at the words, "This is My Body."

With regard to the cup, the variations are greater, but without inconsistency. The two former evangelists mention the giving thanks; the "blessing" is implied in S. Paul's narrative, "*after the same manner* also He took the cup," and confirmed by his words, "the cup of blessing *which we bless*." The words at the delivery of the cup, as reported by S. Matthew, "Drink ye all of it," are not in the other accounts; but S. Mark says, "they all drank of it;" and the fact is implied both by S. Luke and S. Paul. The two former evangelists proceed, "For this is My Blood, which is shed for many;" where S. Matthew adds, "for the remission of sins." In S. Paul the words are, "This cup is the New Testament in My Blood," to which S. Luke adds, "which is shed for you." Finally, this evangelist subjoins the command, "This do in remembrance of me;" in S. Paul this is more particularly applied to both elements, saying after the delivery of the bread, "This do in remembrance of me;" and after the cup, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," or more strictly for my remembrance, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*.

It is remarkable that neither account contains the word "wine." In the evangelists, our Lord speaks of the contents of the cup as the "fruit of the vine;" but S. Paul mentions only "the cup." This is the common expression of the Liturgies and Fathers, though they sometimes specify the contents as "wine and water," the "mixture," and (less often) "wine."

The words and actions of our blessed Lord were

harmonized and made technical, so to speak, in the earliest Liturgies. S. Paul appears to imply that this much was done by the Apostles themselves, and that the Institution was specially revealed to him for the purpose. Certainly such a recital is found in every Liturgy, and must have originated in apostolic times^d.

The Institution consists, then, of three principal acts—*consecration, distribution, and participation*.

The first is comprised in taking, giving thanks over, and blessing the elements, accompanied by the acts of breaking the bread, and (apparently) pouring out the cup.

The second is the delivery of each gift to all present, with the words, "This is my Body," &c.

The third is the entire consumption of both gifts by eating and drinking.

This is what Christ commanded to be done for His Remembrance, and whatever may be the liturgical order followed in the doing, it is plainly no Institution of His from which either of these acts is omitted. In fact, the several acts did not succeed one another in the original Institution, but were so intertwined and contemporaneous, that neither could be completed without the rest. The cup was not blessed till the bread had been consumed, and the consecrated gifts never existed *together* save in the receiver^e.

It has often been wished that we knew the words in which the Lord blessed or consecrated the elements. It is very improbable that He confined His prayer to

^d See Chap. ix. *infra*.

^e This point is admirably illustrated in the Rev. W. Milton's treatise, "Eucharistic Doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Liturgies."

the ordinary thanksgiving of a Jewish Passover; for that supper was ended, when the Eucharist was given to inaugurate the "New Testament in His Blood." These words point to the action of Moses, when he took the blood of the sacrifice and sprinkled it on the people, and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words^f." In initiating a New Covenant in His own Blood, the Lord's thanksgiving and blessing would naturally indicate the character of the Sacrifice He was about to offer, and its relation to the Memorial now established. Many have lamented the want of these benedictory words; perhaps it has not been sufficiently observed that S. John does in fact supply a solemn prayer of thanksgiving and blessing, uttered at the very time of the Eucharistic Institution^g. What, if in this prayer the evangelist, who contributes nothing else to the Eucharistic narrative, should have supplied the substance of the consecrating Benediction?

A *consecration* it undoubtedly is; and one link of connexion with the Eucharist is supplied in the words, "lifted up His eyes to heaven;" for this sentence, though not occurring in either of the narratives of the Supper, was always religiously preserved in the ancient Liturgies. In this prayer, which throughout is eminently priestly, our Lord consecrates Himself to His Heavenly Father on behalf of His Church^h;

^f Exod. xxiv. 8.

^g S. Matthew tells us that "when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives;" and S. John, that "when Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples unto the brook Cedron."

^h John xvii. 19.

speaking of the work which was given Him to do as already "finished," and challenging the glory due to Him in return. He prays for those whom He had kept in the Father's Name, while He was in the world, that God would keep them through the same, when He Himself should have returned to Him. They are to be kept in communion with Himself, and through Him with the Father, "that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." Such were certainly some of the utterances of our great High-Priest just before, or after, the delivery of the bread and wine as His Body and Blood; and they speak of that communion with Him which the Sacrament was designed to impart¹.

He has closed the Old Testament with the last Passover, and now stands before God to initiate the New Testament with the Blood of the great Sacrifice, already regarded as "finished." He is going out to the Agony, and the Betrayal, and the Passion. It is a night to be much remembered unto the Lord of all the children of the spiritual Israel. Christ our Passover is sacrificed; for, though a few hours must intervene before the consummation, it is now that He "lays down His life of *Himself*." On the Cross the Sacrifice will be bound, and pierced and slain, by the hands of wicked men. It is in the chamber of the Passover that He spontaneously devotes Himself "to do the will of God." *There* He says of Himself, as Agent, "I have finished the work that Thou gavest

¹ This greatest blessing of the Sacrament is expressed only in this prayer, and in the discourse in John vi.

me to do," though it was not till the next day that He could say of the work passively, "It is finished."

The hour then is come; the Mediator of the New Covenant is passing from the paschal sacrifice to its fulfilment in the kingdom of God. And first He initiates a sacrificial Memorial of the impending Sacrifice of Himself. His actions and His words are all sacrificial. The solemn benediction and devotion, the Body broken, the Blood shed for the remission of sins, no Jew could have understood of anything but sacrifice.

It is certain, indeed, that the disciples did not at this time understand the doctrine of the atonement. They had not in the least realized their Master's warnings of His approaching death, and after it they had no expectation of His resurrection. Still they would recognise the language and symbols of the Paschal rite, with the other sacrificial terms of the Institution. Neither could they mistake the well-known use of eating of the Peace-offering, or the familiar name of the Remembrance or memorial. The deep significance of this last word is less apparent to the modern reader, but little acquainted with the Levitical ritual, and far removed from the ancient associations of sacrificial worship. Reading it in our own language, we are apt to assume that it means no more than a remembrance of Christ's death on the part of His disciples. But besides that Baptism and the Creed might suffice for this, it must be borne in mind that the Apostles were Jews, as familiar with the Temple ritual as we are with our own Liturgy, and would naturally take the word in its ritual signification. When a Christian bishop speaks of Confirma-

07354

tion or Communion, we understand him of the Christian rites so denominated, not of some new mental exercise of faith and devotion.

So, too, must the ritual word *ἀνάμνησις* have borne in the ears of the disciples its familiar ritual meaning. It occurs but in one other place of the New Testament, and there it signifies not the sinner's remembrance of his iniquity, but the Remembrance of the Sin-offering, made before God by the presentation of its blood within the veil^k. The exact expression, *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, is used in the Septuagint of the incense placed upon the shew-bread^l. In other places we find the substantive, "memorial^m;" and in one the full expression, "a sacrifice of memorial bringing to remembranceⁿ." So the voice of the trumpet blown over the sacrifices, or sounding an alarm against the enemy, is said to "be for a memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) before your God. And ye shall be remembered before the Lord^o." So, again, the prayers and alms of Cornelius are said to "come up for a memorial before God," "and to be had in remembrance in His sight^p."

The Remembrance, then, was not an act of human memory, but a sacrificial rite, appealing to God

^k Heb. x. 3.

^l Levit. xxiv. 7. See note on p. 20. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, III. 6, s. 6), the loaves were arranged in two piles, with a golden cup containing the incense standing on each. This is confirmed by the sculptures on the Arch of Titus, where, among the spoils of the Temple, the table is seen with the two cups upon it. The incense was a memorial to connect the people with the holocaust, and offer them up a living sacrifice.—Comp. Exod. xxv. 30, and the "Speaker's Commentary," on both passages.

^m Levit. ii. 2, 9, 16, &c. τὸ μνημόσυνον = εἰς ἀνάμνησιν.

ⁿ See note on p. 22. ^o Numb. x. 9, 10. ^p Acts x. 4, 31.

to remember and be gracious to His people. The same language is used in prayer, in which God is reminded by words, as in sacrifice by symbols. Both are probably referred to when He says by the prophet, "Put me in remembrance, let us plead together¹." We are not concerned to enquire how far such expressions are *anthropomorphic*;—a word which has been used against all forms of worship, against prophecy and inspiration, against the miracles and incarnation of the Son of God, against the providence, and even the existence of God Himself. It is enough to know that it is the language both of the Old and New Testaments, which the disciples could not fail to recognise.

Turning from the obscurity of the moment, to the light thrown upon the Sacrament by the revelation of the doctrine of the Cross, we find S. Paul describing it as "shewing the Lord's death," and "the communion of His Body and Blood²." This, again, is the language of the Levitical Ritual. The body and blood of the victim were offered on the altar to shew its death, and claim the promised atonement. So, too, the *azkarah*³ of the meat-offering was to represent, or shew, on the altar the whole gift of which it was a part; and the same office was discharged in the Peace-offering by the portions presented on the altar. The "remnant" on

¹ Isa. xliii. 26; comp. Gen. ix. 15; Lev. xxvi. 42; Ps. xx. 3; xxv. 6, 7; lxxix. 8; Heb. x. 18.

² 1 Cor. xi. 26; x. 16, 17.

³ In Proop's Hebrew and Spanish Bible, which is a great authority, *azkarah* is rendered by *memoria* when it refers only to the memory of man, as in Exod. iii. 15; but where the memorial sacrifice to God is intended, (as in Levit. ii. 2, v. 12; Numb. v. 26, &c.,) the word is *sahumerio*, a "fumigation," going up from the altar.

which the priests and people feasted, being offered by their representatives on the altar, were included in the sacrifice; so that eating them was eating of the sacrifice, a partaking of the altar, a feasting at the Lord's Table. The Memorial, which represented the sacrifice on the altar before God, was also the means of communicating all that lay on the altar to the portions eaten by the worshippers, and through them to the worshippers themselves. This is exactly what S. Paul says of the Eucharist. It is the Remembrance to shew the Lord's death, and plead the atonement effected in His Blood; and it is the Communion of the Body and Blood offered in that atoning sacrifice.

Reading the Institution in the light of this apostolic comment, we perceive that our Lord puts Himself in the place of the paschal lamb, and therein of all the bloody sacrifices of the Levitical Ritual; superseding them all by the one offering of the Cross, and making His Body and Blood,—in other words, His death,—the one atoning sacrifice of the New Covenant¹. The Eucharist is the Remembrance and the Communion,—the *azkarah*—of this everlasting Sacrifice.

It may be objected that the *azkarah* was the portion burnt on the altar, not the "remnant" eaten by the priests; but the whole idea of the rite was to regard these as one and the same thing. The *azkarah* was identified, in sacrificial construction, not only with the "remnant," but with the holocaust itself; whence it

¹ "Divisa autem corporis et sanguinis dispensatio ipsam refert Domini mortem, in qua a corpore eductus est sanguis." "In sancta cena ea vis est, ac si eodem semper momento Jesu Christi Corpus traderetur et sanguis effunderetur."—Beng., Gnom. Nov. Test., in Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.

was the medium of deriving the virtue and power of the Burnt-offering into the food eaten by the worshippers. The remnant eaten by the priests in the holy place was thus itself "a thing most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire;" in partaking of the remnant, they partook of the *azkarah*, and through that of the Burnt-offering, the especial "food of the Lord." Precisely so, when Jesus was about to offer Himself as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world^u, He first assumed to Himself the bread and wine, and having sanctified them by His blessing, gave them to be eaten and drunk as the very Sacrifice—His Body and His Blood; and He added, "Do this, (i.e. take, give thanks, bless, eat and drink,) for My Remembrance."

In this Memorial, it has been observed, one feature is entirely new,—the communion of the Blood. In the typical sacrifices the blood was the life, i.e. the life taken in sacrifice and accepted on the altar for atonement; it was the ritual presentation of the victim's death. The most solemn offering of this kind was the yearly presentation, within the vail, of the blood of the Sin-offering, termed by the Apostle a Remembrance of sin. Of this Remembrance there was no *communion*. The blood was sprinkled on the mercy-seat, the sanctuary, the altar, the vessels, the priests, and (in the original federal consecration) on

^u John i. 29. The reference here is directly to the daily Burnt-offering rather than the Paschal Lamb; but the Passover, like the older sacrifices of the patriarchs, included all the subsequent developments of the Levitical Ritual; and the language of the several classes of sacrifice is indiscriminately applied in the New Testament to Christ, the universal Antitype.

the people, but no one ever *drank* of it. They knew that without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins; but of all the blood shed in sacrifice, only these few drops were given back for an external sanctification. The bulk of it flowed away from the altar, without participation, and the earth swallowed it up. Now, for the first time, the Blood of the Sacrifice is given to drink;—to be “in us,” (according to the Saviour’s own figure^x), an ever-springing fountain of sanctification. The Blood of the True Sacrifice, “having obtained eternal redemption for us,” is added to the Eucharistic Remembrance, as the principle of a new and spiritual life, in the mystery of the Cup.

Such is the Institution of Christ. Three points may at once be noted, in refutation of the chief corruptions of later ages.—1. Its one proper use is in eating and drinking: these are the governing words of the whole Institution; the actions of taking and blessing are in order to the oral reception, and without this it is no Sacrament of Christ. 2. The Cup is as necessary to the Institution of Christ as the bread; He assigns a separate function to each, and neither can supply the place of the other. 3. The bread is the Body *sacrificed*, and the wine the Blood *shed*; their separation in the Sacrament symbolises their separation in fact; i.e. they represent the death of Christ, when the Blood was drawn out of His veins, and His Body hung dead and bloodless on the Cross. It is *so* that the Bread is His Body and the Wine His Blood;—two separate things having their proper symbols or sacraments, without mixture or coalition.

^x John iv. 13.

One other place, and only one, in the New Testament speaks of the same actions,—eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood; and no one probably ever read the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, without at once connecting it with the subsequent institution of the Eucharist. It is constantly so referred to by the Fathers, and in their Liturgies as well as in our own⁷. Nevertheless, it has been much disputed by learned men, within and without the Roman obedience, whether this discourse is properly to be *interpreted* of the Sacrament, or only *applied* to it by way of illustration. The distinction is eminently polemical; invented to avoid some supposed consequences of the natural interpretation, without renouncing the manifest connexion of the two passages. No one *interprets* it so rigidly, as to suppose the reception of the Sacrament to be the one condition of eternal life, and no one *applies* it so loosely, as not to make this discourse a main element of Eucharistic teaching.

Bellarmino, who accepts the sacramental interpretation, attributes the denial of some Roman divines to the difficulty they found in reconciling it with the suppression of the Cup; and in this (it may be) they were wiser than their Church. Luther and Calvin had their own difficulties, in harmonizing their views of justification with the efficacy which this discourse attributes to the Sacrament. Probably few in the present day

⁷ John vi. See the extracts in Chap. ix., and in our own Liturgy the First Exhortation at the Communion, the Prayer of Humble Access, &c. It will be observed that it is this discourse in John vi. alone which supplies the word "Flesh," and the expression, so universal in Eucharistic phraseology, "dwelleth in me, and I in him."

would altogether endorse the pious casuistry of Jeremy Taylor, or the subtle distinctions of the intellectual Waterland. Their strongest objection is, that receiving the Sacrament cannot be the sole condition of eternal life; but it is not unusual with our blessed Lord, to enunciate a proposition in broad and general terms, without expressing the conditions and limitations naturally and necessarily implied. It is of far greater moment, that we can have no authority to "apply" His words to a subject of which they were not spoken. If the Eucharist were not really the subject, or one of the subjects of this discourse, no Eucharistic doctrine ought to be founded upon it; and then the spiritual indwelling of Christ, which is the chief grace of the Sacrament, would be left to uncertain inference. For it is *only* in this discourse that our Lord says, "he that eateth and drinketh, dwelleth in me, and I in him^{*}." If these words were not spoken of the Eucharist, who has the right to "apply" them to it? Yet this is the main article of the Catholic teaching; and when we consider that these are the only two places in all the Scripture where these highly remarkable words are found, it must be a very resolute prejudice that refuses to see the connexion.

It may be true, (as Waterland insists,) that "feeding on Christ's Flesh and Blood *means* partaking of His salvation;" but this is no reason against the sacramental interpretation, because the Sacrament "*means*" the same thing. The question is, how this

^{*} John vi. 56; comp. xvii. 21; a strong argument for the connexion of both with the Holy Eucharist.

meaning came to be expressed in words which literally denote the sacramental action, if the Sacrament were not referred to? why should a spiritual grace be spoken of under the figure of eating and drinking, unless the reference was to the Sacrament, which employs those very actions for the enjoyment of the same grace?

In the parallel form of expression transmitted by the same evangelist^a, there is no doubt that regeneration is the entrance to the kingdom of God, yet the passage is rightly interpreted of Baptism, as the Sacrament of regeneration, and the only washing by water and the Holy Ghost ordained by Christ. In like manner, the Holy Eucharist is the Sacrament of the atonement, and the only ordained form of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of the Cross. In both, the words seem to be properly and primarily interpreted of the Sacrament, and through the Sacrament of the spiritual benefit it was given to impart.

That the Eucharist was not instituted at the time of the discourse at Capernaum, is an objection of Calvin and Cranmer. Neither was Baptism instituted till after the conversation with Nicodemus by night. The object and necessity of a sacrament might well be taught before its actual institution, even as the Institution itself preceded the spiritual grace. The objection would exclude the Passion itself no less than its Sacrament; for the Body and Blood were not actually given and shed, when He said in the present tense, "he that eateth and drinketh hath eternal life,"

^a John iii. 5.

any more than when He said, "this is my Body broken, this is my Blood shed^b."

The truth is, that no interpretation of the words is *possible* without recourse to the Eucharist. It is this which supplies the figure, by means of which the spiritual signification is introduced. No other Scripture speaks at all of eating Christ's Flesh and drinking His Blood, and the sole authority for interpreting these words of spiritual communion is that such is the meaning and object of the sacramental actions^c. In short, the more closely we compare the discourse at Capernaum with the words of Institution, the more we shall be disposed to agree with Bengel, that at Capernaum,

"Jesus knowingly so framed His words, that both at the time, and always, they should properly treat of spiritual fruition; but so that also they might afterwards centre in the august mystery of the Holy Supper, when it should be instituted. For the very thing proposed in this discourse He bestowed upon the Holy Supper: and this Sacrament

^b This present tense is urged by Dean Goode, in his learned work on "The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist," as an unanswerable proof that the blessing was *then* enjoyed, and consequently could not refer to an Institution yet in the future. Probably he did not observe the effect of his argument on the Passion, then equally future; since he would be the last to allow that the advantages of the atonement were not available till after the Crucifixion, and consequently inaccessible to the Old Testament Saints. Bishop Taylor, on the contrary, thinks the *future* tense in ver. 51 a trifle, because "spiritual sumption," being of never-failing truth, the future is the most proper tense, and "it would be strange if it were not expressed in the future."—*Real Presence*, s. iii. 1.

^c "Qui particeps est Sanguinis et Corporis Christi, particeps est etiam Sacrificii in cruce peracti, particeps denique ipsius Christi."—*Bengel*, Gnom. Nov. Test., in 1 Cor. x. 16.

is of such great moment, that it may easily be thought that, as in the seventy-first verse, He foretold the treason of Judas, and His own death, so also, in the fifty-first verse, He foretold the Holy Supper, which was most certainly in His thoughts when these words were spoken, a year before the Institution, that His disciples might afterwards remember the prediction. All this whole discourse of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, relates to the Passion, and with it to the Holy Supper. Hence the separate mention of Flesh and Blood throughout, for in the Passion the Blood was drawn out of the Body, and the Lamb was immolated ^d."

This distinction between the Flesh and the Blood, (so essential both to the Sacrifice and the Sacrament,) is lost sight of in denying the sacramental interpretation. It is not simply communion with Himself, that Christ speaks of, but communion by the double action of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. This is found *nowhere else but in the two symbols of the Eucharist.*

It by no means follows that every part of the discourse relates to the Eucharist in equal measure. On the contrary, the purely spiritual feeding is clearly distinguished from the sacramental, and the confusion of the two is at the root of the Tridentine explanation. In the former part, where only spiritual communion is intended, our Lord speaks of Himself under the figure of bread: "I am the Bread of Life, he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." Here there is no sacrament, and no eating or drinking, but purely spiritual communion by faith. This continues down

^d Gnom. Nov. Testament., in John vi. 51.

to the fifty-first verse, in the middle of which our Lord changes the subject, from Himself to something which He will give "for the life of the world^e." The gift is not Himself but His "Flesh;" i.e. the human nature which He took of His virgin mother, and offered for the life of the world on the Cross^f. Here is the Sacrifice, and then comes the Communion of it. "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." Here the Eucharistic action is plainly introduced. It is not simply His Flesh—His human nature,—but His Flesh and Blood, the two parts of the sacrificed humanity, which plead the atonement purchased by His death. These are the very gifts of the Holy Eucharist, exhibited in two separate symbols, and received in the two separate actions of eating and drinking.

Nothing could more clearly mark the distinction between the Giver and the gifts; the first is Himself, the second His instruments; He is one, they are two;

- * The change of subject is distinctly marked in the original by the particle *δε*, omitted in our translation.

^f Flesh (*σὰρξ*) differs from body (*σῶμα*) as the part from the whole; strictly speaking, it means the cellular tissue, as distinct from the blood and the bones, and is thus equivalent to *κρέας*, the Levitical word for the flesh of the animal sacrifices. Metaphorically, it is used of the whole human nature, (1 John i. 14; Gal. ii. 16); and the expression, "flesh and blood," occurs in the same sense (Matt. xvi. 17), but with reference to its imperfection and corruption, (1 Cor. xv. 50). When flesh and blood are spoken of *apart*, it can mean nothing but death; whence, though the living humanity of Christ in heaven might, perhaps, be denoted by the single word "flesh," it is impossible to assign that meaning to the double expression, "flesh and blood." It is to be noted also that "blood" is never predicated of His living Body. See especially Luke xxiv. 39; Eph. v. 30.

He is the living Christ, they are His sacrificed Flesh and Blood. No less distinct is His action in giving from the receiver's eating and drinking, which is the action of the Sacrament. The words of Institution are not "come," or "believe,"—which explain the purely spiritual eating,—but strictly and exactly "eat my Body and drink my Blood," the precise words of the discourse at Capernaum. Then follows the spiritual result: "For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed;" ἀληθῶς, i.e. spiritual, not bodily. "He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." Here the means are plainly distinguished from the end. The means are to eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, actions explained only in the Eucharist; for though eating *bread* was a general figure for spiritual nourishment, eating *flesh* related only to partaking of a sacrifice, and drinking blood was unknown to either. It is the Eucharist alone which supplies these figures, being the chief means of the grace referred to. The grace itself—the indwelling of Christ, and spiritual incorporation with Him—is the spiritual result of a right receiving of the Sacrament.

Putting the two plainly parallel passages together, the distinction between Christ Himself, and the means of communion with Him, comes fully out. His personal indwelling is the result of a fit reception of the Sacrament. The distribution is clear; the Body or Flesh in the bread, the Blood in the cup, and Christ—the living "*I*"—in the spirit and soul of the receiver; so recalling the great promise of the elder covenant, "I will dwell among them and be their God." The same

distribution is made in our own Prayer of Humble Access, "Grant us so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be cleansed by His Body, and our souls washed by His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us^g."

After thus leading us, through the reception of His Body and Blood, to the spiritual fruition of Himself, our Lord returns to the original figure of Bread of life. Uniting the end with the beginning of His discourse, in an eating altogether spiritual, He proceeds, "This is that Bread that came down from heaven; he that eateth of this Bread (whether in the Sacrament or without the Sacrament,) shall live for ever." The sacramental interpretation no more excludes the spiritual, than the Eucharist itself excludes, or monopolises, spiritual communion. These acts are signs and pledges of grace, not grace itself; and according to the old maxim, *gratia non est alligata sacramentis*, our Church instructs us that, where the Sacrament is not attainable, its grace and blessing may be enjoyed without it through faith^h.

The Tridentine explanation would elude the distinction, here drawn between the Giver and the gifts, by confounding the twofold eating and drinking of the Flesh and Blood, which belong to the Sacrament, with the figurative eating of the Bread of life. By this artifice one symbol is substituted in the place of two, and the whole living Person of Christ is identified with each and all of the four things spoken of

^g A similar, but inferior prayer occurs in the Liturgy of S. Basil.

^h See the rubric at the end of the Communion of the Sick.

—Bread, Body, Wine, Blood. This is to make a new Sacrament, in one kind, of which bread, or rather the accidents of bread are the *sacramentum*, and “whole Christ,” the *res sacramenti*. But this is not the Institution of the Gospels. There the bread is the Body and not the Blood; the wine is the Blood and not the Body, and neither is “whole Christ,” though He comes to us by those gifts, to dwell in us and unite us to Himself.

When the scriptural doctrine was revived in the Church of England, the Papists charged it with Nestorianism, as exhibiting Christ’s Body in the Sacrament abstracted from His Divinity¹; and the cavil has been lately repeated in quarters where a better theology might have been expected. Christ’s Body is exhibited in the Eucharist as it was seen on the Cross;—given in sacrifice for the life of the world, with its Blood shed for the remission of sins. If His Divinity was not “abstracted” in the fact, why should it be in the Sacrament²? The objection supposes

¹ Collier, *Eccl. Hist.*, p. ii. b. vi. “For either they hold no more than an imaginary Presence, or else they believe His Body is present abstracted from His Divinity; and thus they fall into the wicked heresy of Nestorius.”—Speech of Scott, Bp. of Chester, against Queen Elizabeth’s Act of Uniformity.

² “Quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab animâ separavit? Animam vero a verbo non separavit.”—*S. Aug. in Johann.*, 47. The same argument applies to the Body; indeed, it was the union of the indivisible Deity with each that effected the Resurrection. “Quoniam Deitas quæ ab utrâque suscepti hominis substantiâ non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit.”—*Leo, Serm. I. De Resurr.* See Pearson’s Exposition of the Creed, Art. iv., where is a fine passage from Gregory Nyss.: “For since man’s nature is a twofold combination, but the Nature of the Deity is one and indivisible; in the moment of the

a natural presence of Christ's whole human nature in the one symbol, but the Lord Himself gave His 'dead Body in one, His Blood in another, and His human Soul in neither. It is no heresy to distinguish these gifts from the Person of the Giver. When the Word was made Flesh, it was not "by conversion of the Godhead into Man, but by taking of the Manhood into God." The Person of the Divine Word was not merged in the Humanity, nor identified with it. The Flesh was His instrument, His robe (as the great Fathers call it), in and by means of which He accomplished His mediation with God and man¹. From that Flesh, living or dead, His Divinity was never more divided. The dissolution of Body and Soul could not destroy the hypostatic union. God the Word did not desert the Soul of Jesus in Paradise, nor His dead Body on the Cross. It was the union of the indivisible Deity with each that effected the Resurrection. Still the Person of the God-Man was not in His dead Body, or in the Blood shed out of its veins; much less in their Eucharistic symbols.

The question asked at Capernaum was not, "how

dissolution of body and soul, the indivisible is not divided with that which it holds in union, but remains entire; for in the oneness of the Divine Nature, which is equally in both, the separated parts are united with one another,"

¹ "He did not become other than Himself on taking the flesh, but being the same He was *robed* in it. . . . The Word, being Creator, was afterwards made High-Priest by clothing Himself with a generated created Body, which He could offer on our behalf."—*Athanasius, Cont. Ar. Orat.* ii. 8. "'In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;' which is as much as to say that being God He had His own Body, and using this as an instrument (*ὄργανον*) was made man for us."—*Ibid., Orat.* iii. 31.

shall this Man give us Himself to eat," but, "how shall He give us His *Flesh*?" and His answer in the paschal chamber is not, "This is Myself or my Person," but distributively of each symbol, "Take, eat, this is my Body broken; drink, this is my Blood shed." He is not absent, as the Fathers wrote, from the mysteries, for He dwells in the communicants, and they in Him. Still the Giver is not to be confounded with His gifts. It is not Nestorianism to discern between the Lord's Body and the Lord Himself; but it may be treading on the worse heresy of Eutychianism, to imagine such "a confusion of substance," as would remove the tabernacle, which He claims for Himself, in the immortal consciousness of the soul, to the material elements of bread and wine.

The Institution is further illustrated in the New Testament, from a comparison with the Sin-offering of the Law. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (which it is still lawful to ascribe to S. Paul) the Eucharistic Remembrance is characteristically contrasted with the Levitical "remembrance of sin." The argument is that the Sin-offering, with all other sacrifices of blood, were fulfilled and superseded by the one Offering of Jesus Christ once for all, and His entry with His own Blood into heaven itself, there to remain in the presence of God, a perpetual Mediator. The concluding chapter contains (as usual) a short practical exhortation on the doctrine so expounded, and in this is found a brief but pregnant reference to the Remembrance of the New Covenant in the Blood of Christ^m.

This passage has been well-nigh explained off the face

^m Heb. xiii. 10—16.

of the Scripture by the prejudice against sacrifice. The Apostle is consoling the Hebrew Christians under the taunts of their unbelieving brethren, who reproached them as outcasts from the altar, the sacrifices, and the sacrificial banquets. He does not tell them (as some would now), that these were Old Testament shadows which have fled before Gospel light; but he insists that "we have an altar" of our own, where we partake of a sacrifice that no Levitical priest could presume to approach. This sacrifice was typified in the greater Sin-offering, of which the blood was brought into the sanctuary, and the body was burned to ashes without the camp; hence "they have no right to eat of it, who serve the tabernacle." In the Church of Christ, he says, it is otherwise; Jesus our Sin-offering has also suffered without the gate, and has also, with His own Blood, entered as our High-Priest into the holy place not made with hands. So far, however, from there being no right to eat of this sacrifice, "we have an altar" where we both eat of His Body and drink of His Blood.

Clearly, this altar is the Holy Table of the Eucharist; to explain it of merely spiritual participation, is to compare a figure of speech with a liturgical rite. The Jew enjoyed the spiritual participation of his Sin-offering, i.e. he received its spiritual benefit by faith. What the Apostle urges is that he had no right to *eat* of it, and the Christian has. No doubt the eating implies (as in all the sacrifices) a spiritual benefit; but the Apostle lays the comparison not in the degree of grace, but in the visible means. He contrasts eating with not eating,—the frequent privilege of every

Christian with the strict prohibition even to the priests of the tabernacle. To explain away his words, in what some call a spiritual sense, is to make him say "we have *not* an altar, but we have something far betterⁿ."

That the Apostle alludes in some way to Holy Communion is generally allowed, and if so, the "sacrifice of praise," in ver. 15, comes very near to the primitive phrase "Eucharistic Sacrifice." It is immediately explained as "the fruit of lips giving thanks to His Name," but vocal utterance is not necessarily exclusive of symbolical worship. The Apostle cannot mean (as some assume) to *oppose* this sacrifice to the sacrifices of the Old Testament, because his words are in fact quoted from the prophet Hosea, who was an Old Testament worshipper^o. The very name "sacrifice of

ⁿ To avoid this direct violence to the Scripture, some would explain the altar of the *Cross*; but this also is a metaphor like the "altar in heaven." In a liturgical sense the Cross was not an altar. The victim was never *slain* on the altar; it was the place on which the *dead* body was presented, to claim the atonement and communicate the sacrifice. The Levitical sin-offering never came on the altar at all, because there was no right to eat of it. Moreover, the Apostle distinguishes between the Cross and the Christian altar, in noting that the former was without the gate. Others have recourse to a metonymy of the altar for the sacrifice, which Schleusner supports from 1 Cor. ix. 13; but the meaning there is not simply that they partake of the victim, but that they are *fellow-partakers* of it (*συμμερίζονται*) with the altar. In this place the Apostle does not say, we have a sacrifice, but an altar from which to eat, *ἐξ οὗ φάγῃν*; that *θυσιαστήριον* means nothing but altar, the place on which the victim was laid after death for liturgical presentation to God, is as certain as that the Septuagint uses the same word in Mal. i. 7, as synonymous with *τράπεζα κυρίου*, the Lord's Table.

^o Hosea xiv. 2; see also Ps. l. 14, 23, where the LXX has the Apostle's very phrase, *θυσία αἰνέσεως*. S. Augustine writes: "The sacrifice

praise," denoted (as we have seen) in the Levitical Ritual an offering of cakes, and perhaps of wine^p. That it included also vocal prayer and song is not to be doubted, and may it not be equally inferred that the Apostle's sacrifice of praise comprehended the Christian rite, which was ever the leading feature of the apostolic liturgy^q?

The suggestion is strengthened by the mention of sacrifices of alms in the next verse^r; for these also have been an invariable accompaniment of the Eucharistic celebration; a rite which offers a higher sacrifice of praise than any Levitical ordinance, and comprehends in the oblation the whole mystical Body of Christ.

of praise shall glorify me, &c. The flesh and blood of this sacrifice, before the coming of Christ, was promised by victims of resemblances; in the Passion of Christ it was exhibited in very truth. After Christ's Ascension, it is celebrated by the sacrament of remembrance (*sacramentum memoriae*)."—*Cont. Faust.*, xx. 21.

^p Levit. vii. 12; Ps. i. 14, 23, and see *ante* p. 21.

^q The Apostle substitutes the sacrificial word ἀναφέρωμεν for ἁγιοποιῶμεν which the Septuagint gives in Hosea, and the *anaphora* was the liturgical name of the Eucharistic oblation. These coincidences would be trifles to prove the celebration of the Eucharist; but the celebration being certain, it is more than likely to be referred to whenever Christian worship is mentioned. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1, cited in our Offertory Prayer; and 1 Cor. xiv. 16, compared with x. 16.

^r ἐνδοία, which is not found elsewhere in the New Testament or LXX., is supposed to be equivalent to ἐλεημοσύνη, alms; cf. Acts ii. 44; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Justin Martyr, *infra*, and Matt. v. 23; which the Fathers almost universally refer to the Eucharist: for κοινωνία in a similar sense see Rom. xv. 26, and 2 Cor. ix. 13: S. Basil also uses it in this sense without the article. The two together indicate the large and generous charity expressed in the authorized version, "to do good and to distribute," and the selection of the verse for the offertory in the first English Liturgy shews its natural relation to the Eucharist.

The whole may be paraphrased in this way :—

“ Remember what the Lord said to Joshua when he succeeded in the place of our great lawgiver, to bring the Church and tabernacle of the wilderness into the possession of the Gentiles : ‘ As I was with Moses so will I be with thee : I will not fail thee nor forsake thee*.’ This should encourage us to say, as our fathers did when they returned out of captivity, and kept the Passover again, ‘ the Lord is my helper, I will not fear : what can man do unto me ? ’ The Church was not always at Jerusalem, and the Prophet, as I have said[†], foretells another removal when the Desire of all nations shall come, that we, receiving a permanent kingdom and priesthood, may have grace to minister (λατρεύμεν) acceptably to God with reverence and piety. That ‘ once more ’ is now come. Remember your leaders under the true Joshua, those who have spoken to you the Lord’s word, and considering their outgoing from the conversation of the Jews[‡], imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and will be for ever. He is the True

* Josh. i. 5 ; comp. Acts vii. 38, 45. Origen writes, with reference to the final cessation of the Jewish rites : “ When thou seest that all these things are no longer celebrated, say that Moses the servant of God is dead. But when thou seest Gentiles coming in to the faith, churches built, altars not sprinkled with blood of cattle, but consecrated with the precious Blood of Christ ; when thou seest priests and Levites ministering not the blood of bulls and of goats, but the Word of God through the grace of the Holy Ghost,—then say that Jesus has succeeded Moses, and obtained the kingdom ; not Jesus the son of Nun, but Jesus the Son of God. . . . Say that Moses the *servant* of God is dead, and Jesus the *Son* of God obtains the kingdom.”—*In Josh., Hom. ii.*

† Ps. cxviii. 6 ; compare Ezra vi. 19—22.

‡ Heb. xii. 26—28.

‡ τὴν ἐκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, commonly interpreted, “ the end of their life ; ” but this is disputed in M^cCaul’s valuable commentary on the Epistle. In the only other place where ἐκβασις is found in the New Testament (1 Cor. x. 13), it is translated, “ way to escape.”

Sacrifice and the Eternal Priest. Be not carried away again to those diversified, unreconciling rites^γ; the true peace is to be strengthened and refreshed by grace in the heart, not by bodily meats, which have little profited those who go the round of them. We have an altar of which the very priests of the Tabernacle are not allowed to eat. For of those victims whose blood is carried into the Most Holy Place by the high-priest for the Sin-offering, the bodies are burned without the camp. No one is permitted to eat of them. In like manner Jesus suffered without the gate, that He might sanctify the people with His own Blood, which He has carried into heaven itself, there to appear without intermission in the Presence of God for us. But our Sin-offering is not reduced to ashes; we eat of His Body and drink of His Blood from the Christian altar. Forth, then, to Him without the camp let us go, gladly bearing that reproach of His. For not in this have we our abiding city, but we are seeking that which has to come. By Him, therefore, our High-priest in heaven, let us continually offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, that is, the first-fruits (or, as the Prophet says, the victims) of lips confessing and giving thanks to His Name^z; neither be forgetful of the alms and communion; for such are the sacrifices with which God is well pleased."

This paraphrase will be found nearer to the *usus loquendi* of the Epistle and of S. Paul than some so-called

^γ Comp. x. i. The variety and repetition of the rites argued their inability to reconcile the conscience: the worshippers were still "strangers" to the promised Rest (comp. iv. 8; xi. 13, 14). Both here and in vi. 2, *διδασχῆ* means "institutions" or "rites," rather than doctrines. The "meats," too, refer to the *sacrifices*, not the domestic meals.

^z "Temporibus Messiae omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sed sacrificium laudis non cessabit."—In *Midrasch Tehillim*, ad Ps. ii., cited with other similar testimonies in Canon M^cCaul's Commentary.

translations. The contrast between the Eucharistic Remembrance and the Levitical remembrance of sin is entirely in keeping with the previous exposition; and it seems only natural that the Apostle should subjoin a practical exhortation on the chief Christian rite, at the close of this noble exposition of the expired types of the law.

One word more, before we pass from the light of Scripture to the shadows of controversy. The Eucharist was the constant, probably the invariable, act of public worship in the time of the Apostles. By the Christians of Jewish race it was celebrated in their own assemblies, contemporaneously with the Levitical rites, which they diligently observed till the Temple and its altar were removed. It follows that this rite could not be opposed to the Old Testament worship, but was complementary and inclusive of it. Like the Great Sacrifice itself, the Eucharistic Memorial was not to abolish but to fulfil the law. It was otherwise with regard to Gentile sacrifices, offered to devils and not to God: with these the Christian could have no fellowship for a moment. The Eucharist was a standing protest against them; he could not be a partaker of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. This marked distinction ought to warn us against the common mistake of setting the New Testament in antagonism to the Old. The same Lord, the same Mediator between God and man, are the objects of both revelations, and the final triumph of the redeemed is to sing in unison the song of Moses and of the Lamb.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

THE Eucharistic Rite of the undivided Church consisted in offering, blessing, and partaking bread and wine mixed with water^a, for the Remembrance and Communion of the sacrifice of the Cross. The oblations originally included gifts of various kinds, brought by the worshippers, and placed on the Holy Table by the priest, who selected out of them the bread and wine to be consecrated for the Sacrament^b. Afterwards,

^a The mixture is the historical fact, whatever be the explanation of it. It is found in all the Liturgies, and in every description of the Eucharist from the first. The Armenians alone celebrated in wine without water; the origin of this exception is unknown; it was condemned by the Quinisext Council (A.D. 683, 692) as heretical. The constant tradition of the Church ascribed the mixture to the original Institution, and it appears to have been the general, if not universal practice of the Jews, to dilute the wine at the Paschal celebration. The mixture was observed throughout the Church, East and West, till the Reformation. It was retained by Luther, and in the first reformed Liturgy of the English Church; but omitted from the second, without prohibition, however, or reason assigned. The Ultra-protestant Reformers discontinued it, partly from indiscriminate antagonism to the existing ritual, and partly because it is not mentioned in Scripture. The latter objection applies to the wine itself, for it is remarkable that the contents of the cup are nowhere expressly named in the New Testament. Some ancient heretics did in fact celebrate in water without wine, and a disposition to revive this error has been shewn by modern advocates of Total Abstinence. The Church has always held, however, that the Blood is signified in the wine, and consequently that the Sacrament is *valid* without water.

^b Notwithstanding the controversy expended on the distinction between lay and sacerdotal oblation, offering is really nothing but placing before

these alone were brought on the altar; the gifts for the ministry and other purposes being distributed elsewhere by the appointment of the bishop. The blessing was a long prayer of thanksgiving, including a recitation of the words of institution, and sealed by the loud *Amen* of the people^c. The communion was in both kinds; and in this action lay the whole force and application of the rite. The elements were offered and blessed with no other purpose than to be partaken of; all present eat and drank of them; portions were sent to the sick, who absent in body desired to be present in spirit; the paschal rule was observed, which forbade anything to be left of it till the morning.

Comparing this service with the Mass now celebrated in the Church of Rome, it is seen at a glance that only one of the persons attending retains the observance of the primitive rite. The officiating priest alone offers, blesses, and partakes, as the Lord commanded. By all others, a new rite of adoration is substituted for the communion, supplemented by a half-communion (for such as desire it) which is not part of the sacrifice. The Council of Trent, indeed, affirms that the Mass is a sacrifice offered by the priest on behalf of the people; this alone would distinguish it from the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the early Church, in every part of which the people communicated with the priest. With the early Christian writers, the Sacrament and the Commemoration, the Communion and the Sacrifice¹, were indivisible. To

God, bringing to His sight and notice the sacrifice presented. There is no such claim in it as the controversialists imagine.

^c Comp. 1 Cor. x. 16; xiv. 16.

‘offer’ was to communicate, and to ‘assist’ or take part in the Sacrifice meant to receive the Sacrament^d.

These acknowledged departures from primitive and Catholic observance have their root in the new doctrine of the Presence, known by the name of Transubstantiation. The Catholic Church has always held the Eucharistic bread to represent the crucified Body, and the wine the out-shed Blood, of Christ our Sacrifice. This is the very purport of the words of Institution, and it is still acknowledged by Roman divines, though popularly lost sight of in a confusion with the doctrine of the Presence. Cardinal Cajetan, among other reasons against the sacramental interpretation of the discourse in John vi., says,—

“It is evident that the real separation of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament is represented only; but in the death of Christ it was actual, and according to the thing itself. He discourses of the Flesh and Blood which were parted in His death, *as they are to be embraced by the mind, being the meat and drink of the soul*.”

Cardinal Perron writes in like manner:—

“The Sacrament is not really the Body of Christ constituted in the actual state of one slain, dead and inanimate; neither in that respect does it contain it, but so far represents it only^f.”

Bellarmino no less clearly acknowledges that—

“the separate consecration of the Body and Blood is to shew

^d See this abundantly established in Mr. Scudamore’s “Communion of the Laity,” and his later most valuable work, *Notitia Eucharistica*, Rivingtons, 1872.

^e Card. Cajetan, In Johann. vi. 53.

^f Card. Perron, de loc. Aug. iii. (Patrick’s Full View, 213.)

their presence in the Supper, after the manner of a slain and dead body."

On this point there is really no question in Catholic divinity. The controversy relates to the Presence of Christ's living, glorified Body, and so of His whole Person, in or with the sacramental representation of His crucified Flesh and out-shed Blood. The Church has never doubted that Christ, the living, glorified God-Man is really present in the sacred mysteries; present in His whole Person, irrespectively of the thoughts of the worshippers, and present in a gracious manifestation beyond what is ordinarily enjoyed in prayer or other religious exercises. This is the special grace of the Eucharist, and to this extent, as Bishop Cosin has shewn, the "Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament" is acknowledged, not only by the Church of England, but in all the principal Protestant Confessions of faith. The Church of Rome alone adds the peculiar tenet of Transubstantiation.

This metaphysical subtlety is the product of a long course of scholastic speculation, in which the term underwent no little diversity of application. The primary mistake may be traced to the mechanical word "contained &," implying that Christ is enclosed in the

* Ascribed by Aquinas to Hugo de S. Vict. (A.D. 1120), but *contineo* simply means "to hold together." Cicero speaks of things "containing" the power of heat; and Horace, of a story "containing" the passions of kings and men. So the Tridentine Decree says that instruction is "contained" in the Mass: and we all speak of the truths contained in the Creed. The Schoolmen, however, insisted on a mechanical inclusion of Christ in the elements, and invented theories to account for it.

sacred symbols, like a jewel in the casket^b. Thomas Aquinas says of the twofold representation in the Eucharist, that—

“One is signified and *contained*, that is Christ Himself; the other is signified and not contained, which is the Church, His mystical Bodyⁱ.”

But there is no more reason for Christ to be “contained” in the symbol, than for the Church to be so. Moreover, the Thing signified or represented, as we have seen, is the *slain* Christ; and what is here held to be “contained,” is the *living* Christ, Body, Soul, and Divinity. This involves a vast amount of confusion of ideas. It is intelligible to say of a living man that his soul is contained in his body, and the Apostle writes that in Christ “dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” But of a dead body, the very idea is that the soul is *not* within it. The Human Soul of Jesus was in Paradise when His Body hung dead on the Cross, and His Blood was poured out on the ground. That His Divinity was not divided from either, is due to the mystery of the Incarnation. But that the living Christ was then “contained” in the dead Christ is certainly not true. Neither, therefore, is He contained in the symbols which represent the dead Christ. It is sufficient that He is present with them as He was with His own Body in the tomb; that is, by a Real but Spiritual Presenceⁱ.

^b Hence the maxim so often repeated, *ubi corpus ibi Christus*, a maxim as true of the mystical Body as of the sacramental, but not to be interpreted of either after the *Pantheistic* fallacy.

ⁱ *Ante*, p. 15 n.; whether *in*, *per*, *cum* or *trans*, Bp. Andrewes says is a matter of opinion, not of faith.

Much of the confusion comes from overlooking the distinction between the crucified Body, represented by the Eucharistic symbols, and the living Body, of which we spiritually partake in receiving them. Waterland observes that—

“the ancients, in their account of spiritual feeding, have often passed over the direct and immediate feeding upon Christ, considered as crucified, and have gone on to what is properly the *result* or consequence of it, namely, to the spiritual union with the Body glorified, and what hangs thereupon¹.”

This remark touches the root of Transubstantiation. The mistake was all the easier from the abbreviated form of the words of Institution in the Roman Missal, *hoc est corpus meum*. These being constantly recited, the *corpus mortuum* came to be confounded with the *corpus vivum*, and the *sanguis*, which ought to have corrected the error, was dropped out of view. The bread, which represented Christ's Body broken, was held to “contain” Christ's Body glorified, because union with Him is the spiritual effect of receiving the sacrament. The sacramental partaking of the Sacrifice was confounded with the mystical incorporation it is designed to effect. The sacrament was made to be Christ's Risen Living Body; and as this must carry with it His whole Human Nature, the cup became needless, and ceased to be administered.

This surprising abuse, committed and persevered in against the continued protest of the forms of consecration, and the repeated condemnations of Councils and

¹ Bp. of London's edit., p. 97.

Popes, made its first appearance as a heresy. It was censured by Leo the Great as a "sacrilegious simulation," and a "symptom of Manichæism^k." Gelasius, in a decree still incorporated in the Canon Law, requires communicants to take the whole sacrament, on pain of being excluded altogether, "because a division of one and the same mystery cannot be made without sacrilege^l."

The Greek usage of the steeped sop was forbidden by the Council of Bracara (A.D. 675), as contrary to the Institution of Christ, who gave the bread and the cup *seorsum*^m.

As late as the end of the eleventh century Popes Urban II. and Pascal II. ordered the symbols to be administered separately, save in cases of necessity, as to young children and dying persons, who might receive the cup alone when unable to swallow the breadⁿ. It is unnecessary to pursue the history further, since the Church of Rome, in going over to

^k Serm. iv. de Quad.

^l Decret. Grat. III. de cons. ii. 12. This canon is now said to apply to the celebrant alone, but the words plainly include all the communicants.

^m Conc. Brac. III. (IV.) Can. i.—"Ut repulsis omnibus opinionibus superstitionum panis tantum et vinum aqua permixtum in sacrificiis offeratur." The language of this canon is a good specimen of the inseparable union of the oblation and the participation in the sacrifice. Both are treated of under the same words, and in *both* the symbols retain their natural names of bread and wine.

ⁿ In Conc. Claromontano sub Urbano II., "Cautum est ne quis de altari communicat nisi corpus separatum et sanguinem similiter sumat, nisi per necessitatem (quod ad infirmos et infantes spectat)." Mart. de Ritibus, i. 430. Other authorities are quoted by Dr. Vogan in his "True Doctrine of the Eucharist," ch. xx.

the great sacrilege it had so long condemned, frankly not to say cynically, acknowledged its defection. The Council of Constance (A.D. 1567), which first decreed the withdrawal of the cup, determined that—

“although Christ instituted this venerable sacrament after supper, and administered it to His disciples under both species of bread and wine, yet this notwithstanding, *tamen hoc non obstante*, the authority of the canons, and the approved custom of the Church require the sacrament not to be celebrated after supper, nor received by any who are not fasting except in case of infirmity. And further, that although in the primitive Church the sacrament was received under both species, the custom was afterwards reasonably introduced, in order to avoid some dangers and scandals, that the celebrant should receive under both species, and the laity under the species of bread only; since it is not to be doubted that the whole Body and Blood of Christ are truly contained under the species of bread as well as under the species of wine. This custom having been reasonably introduced by the Church and the holy fathers, and long observed, the synod decrees it to be held for a law which is not to be altered without the authority of the Church.”

After having thus abandoned the primitive Church, and overruled the Lord Himself, the Council proceeded to excommunicate all who should exhort the people to communicate in both kinds; so taking its side with the Manichæan heresy, and the great sacrilege, denounced by the early popes. The next step was to burn John Huss, who acquiesced in transubstantiation, but contended for the cup, and spoke against indulgences.

The Council of Trent adopted a more cautious, and less candid tone. Its decree asserts that—

“Communion in both kinds is not enjoined universally, and not obligatory by divine precept, on any layman or priest when not celebrating. It overrules the double requirement of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood, in John vi. 53, by the single action of eating bread in the same discourse. The authority of the Church in the administration of the sacrament is dwelt upon, and while acknowledging the use of both species in the beginning of the Christian religion, the Council insists on the propriety of the change, and again anathematizes all who adhere to the original Institution °.”

The excuses here alleged are manifestly inadequate for so great a departure from the primitive use. No other scandal could arise from the use of the cup in the eleventh century than in the first ages, when still larger numbers were suddenly introduced to the Church. But we have evidence of a new doctrine at that time, which logically involves the suppression. It was in the middle of the eleventh century that the word Transubstantiation first appeared, in an Exposition of the canon of the Mass by Petrus Damianus, (1057). It is a metaphysical term taken from the now exploded philosophy which divided matter into *substance* and *accidents*. The substance was an inner essence indiscernible to sense, in which lay the real nature of the thing. The accidents were the “form,” i.e. shape, colour, weight, and other sensible qualities; imagined to be in the object apart from the substance. As different objects were perceived to be possessed of the

° Conc. Trid. Sess. xxi. cap. 1, 2, and Canon I.

same qualities, the schoolmen inferred that one substance might take the place of another, without disturbance to the accidents; and by this conceit they undertook to explain the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist. The "substance" of the Body and Blood was transferred to the bread and wine, without affecting their accidents.

Some hesitation was shewn in including among the "accidents" the power of adding to or taking away from other substances; since that seems peculiarly to belong to the substance matter. It being capable, however, of physical demonstration, that the elements are as effectual to nourishment, and as liable to decay, after consecration as before, these qualities were finally ranked among the accidents.

The dogma was first promulgated in a Decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, (1215), at which also the first canon was made imposing the general obligation of Confession; the Decree affirms:—

"That the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour in the sacrament of the altar is truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread by the Divine omnipotence being transubstantiated into His Body, and the wine into His Blood, in order that, for completing the mystery of the unity, we may receive of Him that which He Himself received of us."

¶ "Una vero est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus. Cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis, pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro."—Conc. Lat. iv., Decreta cap. i., De fide Catholica (Labb and Coss. xi. 143.)

This canon, it should be observed, is wholly grounded on the necessity of actual communion. It recognises no other object or use of the sacrament, and distinctly implies the reception of both species to be necessary to its attainment. Nevertheless it was the beginning of a revolution of thought and practice, which not only mutilated the communion, but finally separated it from the sacrifice, to substitute Adoration in its place.

Cardinal Bona has proved, against Bellarmine and Baronius, that down to the twelfth century the communion was universally administered in both kinds. In the beginning of that century the bishops began to interdict the cup to the people, on account of the risk of irreverence and effusion, when such large multitudes were being brought into the Church. The risk of spilling must have been at least as great in the first age, when three thousand were converted at one sermon, and every convert was a communicant. There was scandal enough in the Corinthian Church, when one was hungry and another was drunken, yet the apostle did not withdraw the cup. It was the new character given to the symbols which caused, first the suppression of one, and then a general recoil from the other.

At this day the Lateran canon furnishes only the name of Transubstantiation; its teaching is quite different from the doctrine enunciated at Constance, three and a half centuries later; as that again falls short of the elaborate hypothesis formulated at Trent. In the elder canon the bread is the Body, and the wine is the Blood, and no interchange of substance

or function is indicated. They are to be received, as well as consecrated, separately and apart, and neither is said to be, or to contain, the *glorified* Humanity united to the communicant in the reception. It is still the old doctrine of the *slain* Body and the *out-shed* Blood of the Sacrifice, the due receiving of which effects the mysterious union between Christ and His Church. The novelty is in the physical or mechanical expressions "contain" and "transubstantiate," of which there is no trace in the ancient teaching.

A still more startling novelty followed, which for centuries eclipsed and superseded the very meaning of the Institution. Instead of the bread being the Body and the cup the Blood, the Council of Constance pronounces "the whole undivided Body and Blood of Christ to be truly contained under the species of bread, as well as under the species of wine." This *identifies* the two things which are exhibited separately in the sacrament, and deprives each of its proper signification. The Body is no longer appropriated to the bread, nor the Blood to the cup, but each "contains" both; so that either without the other is a perfect sacrament. It is impossible to conceive a greater violation of the Institution of Christ, or of the ancient Liturgies. Pope Paschal II. had indeed sanctioned administration in one kind, in cases where the reception of both was physically impossible. So much liberty in respect of outward rites might be claimed on the principle of preferring mercy to sacrifice. The presence of Christ might be relied upon in the reception of one symbol alone, where the other was impossible;

or (as our own Church reminds us), in the absence of both where neither is attainable. But Paschal never imagined either symbol to be, or to represent, the thing signified by the other; and it is remarkable that it was the Blood, and not the Body, which he permitted to be taken alone¹.

The Council of Constance had another object in view. It was manufacturing an apology for the prevalent abuse of communicating in the bread alone. Retaining the old words "Body and Blood," it insinuated a new and wholly unscriptural meaning. It contemplates the Body and Blood, which the sacrament exhibits apart, as re-united in the living Body of Christ. This was wholly inconsistent with the Lateran canon, no less than the obvious purport of the Institution. It could not and did not satisfy the schoolmen. Something more was needed, before that communion with Himself, which our Lord attached to the reception of the two symbols of His crucified Humanity, could be fully concentrated on one.

The final solution was thought to be found when the metaphysical tenet of Transubstantiation was supplemented by the physical illustration of "Concomitance." This new and irrelevant conception is employed by the Council of Trent, to reconcile the discordant utterances of its two predecessors. In one chapter it repeats the Lateran decree, in another it re-asserts the conflicting dogma of Constance, while a third endeavours to effect their reconciliation by affirming,—

¹ Perhaps not only for the physical impediment to the bread, but for the peculiar efficacy always ascribed in Scripture to the Blood.

“That immediately on the consecration, the true Body of our Lord and His true Blood, together with His Soul and Divinity, exist under the species (sing.) of the bread and wine; the Body indeed under the species of the bread, and the Blood under the species of the wine, by virtue of the words (of Institution and Consecration), but the same Body under the species of the wine, and the Blood under the species of the bread, and the Soul under both, *by virtue of the natural connexion and concomitance by which the parts of our Lord Christ, who has now risen from the dead and dieth no more, are held together*; the Divinity, moreover, by reason of its marvellous hypostatic union with His Body and Soul: wherefore it is most true that as much and the same is contained under either species as under both. For whole and entire Christ exists under the species of bread and every part of it, whole and entire also under the species of wine and every part of it*.”

The first remark that occurs on this explanation is, that it plainly constitutes *two* Christs, one in the bread and one in the wine; unless He be supposed to move from one to the other, as the words of consecration are successively pronounced. This is inevitable on the corporal theory, though obviously not involved in the primitive view of a spiritual Presence. The Decree involves the following propositions:—

1. That the elements are converted *severally*,—the bread into the Flesh, and the wine into the Blood. This is the *dead* Body and *outshed* Blood of Christ; since these are the things signified by the two elements, and the words of consecration in virtue of which the conversion is effected. This is confirmed

* Ibid., cap. 3. By *species* is here meant the accidents or appearance; but in the Latin Fathers, this word denotes the entire element.

by the Catechism, which explains the separate consecration, as meant to place the death and passion of our Lord, and the manner of it (i.e. the separation of the Blood from the Body), before the eyes of all with greater force and moment^a.

2. That because the Body and Blood are re-united in heaven, therefore they are united in each of the two species which severally contain them. In other words, the miracle of the Resurrection is *repeated*, not symbolised, in each consecration.

3. That "whole Christ," as He now lives in heaven, is thus present under each species—*they remaining apart*—not by grace and spirit, but by actual conversion of substance.

These propositions are so manifestly contradictory, that the first and last have been practically abandoned; the last by suppressing the cup, and the first by misrepresenting its teaching. The Roman divines (as we have seen) hold that the elements are *not* changed into the slain Body and Blood, but only represent them. This is really to give up Transubstantiation, since the conversion is attributed to the words of consecration, which speak of the Body sacrificed not the Body glorified. Neither element even represents the living Body, nor are there any words to change them into it; this labyrinth has no outlet.

Further, it was not the Body and Blood, but the *Soul* and Body of the Redeemer, which were re-united at the Resurrection; and if we accept a recent

^a "Sanguis enim separatim consecratus, ad passionem Domini et mortem, et passionis genus, ante omnium oculos ponendum, majorem vim et momentum habet."—Cat. Conc. Trid. xxxiii.

conjecture, that the Blood *means* the Soul^t, we are carried still further away from the literal interpretation on which the whole dogma professes to be founded. There is no possible interpretation of the words of Institution, but what refers them to the Body and Blood of the cross. The two elements are either really converted into those two parts of our Lord's humanity, separate and apart, or they signify and represent them in that condition. The former is the Lateran dogma, repeated by the Council of Trent; the latter is the teaching of the Roman divines, as of all others. Their new dogma of conversion into the living Body is so far from being a literal rendering of the words of Institution, that it is no interpretation at all. In point of fact it is not from the words of Institution, but from the discourse at Capernaum, that this dogma is defended; and in that discourse it is not the sacramental terms Flesh and Blood, but the previous figure of *bread*, that the Council appeals to^u. In that figure, no doubt, the living Christ is signified, but the manducation is there explained to be the purely spiritual action of believing on Him. The sacramental action is referred to the Flesh and Blood, the same which are signified by the words of Institution. The *hoc est*, by their

^t Keble's "Euch. A doration."

^u Conc. Trid., Sess. xxi., De Comm. c. 1 : "Sed neque ex sermone illo apud Johan. vi. recte colligitur, utriusque speciei communionem a Domino præceptam esse, utcunque juxta varias sanctorum patrum et doctorum interpretationes intelligatur. Namque qui dixit, Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis, dixit quoque, Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane vivet in æternum."

own confession, relates to the *Corpus mortuum*; of the bread, which signifies the *Corpus vivum*, there is no *hoc est*,—no sacrament, and no sacramental eating or drinking, but “I in Him, and He in me.”

In short, the Roman doctors, in spite of these Councils, teach that the elements neither are nor contain the things which they represent, and are denominated; how, then, is it possible to believe that each of them contains, and is, a Body which it neither represents nor is called?

It is a further objection to the theory of Concomitance that it assumes into the essence of the Eucharist a speculation utterly foreign to its true conception, and without a shadow of authority in itself.

It was questioned among the Fathers whether there be any *blood* in our Lord’s glorified Body in heaven. S. Paul appears to indicate the negative^x, and it is certain that the blood shed upon the cross was not buried in the sepulchre, and so not included in the Resurrection. We read of the flesh and *bones* of our risen Lord, but nowhere of His Blood^y. S. Augustine, though somewhat perplexed with the question, concludes with the apostle, that the spiritual body is not flesh and blood^z. If the Church had then held the Tridentine doctrine of the Presence, he must have demanded with Durandus, “how if there be no Blood in the glorified

^x 1 Cor. xv. 50.

^y Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 27; Eph. iv. 16; v. 30. Also Art. IV., where we have flesh and bones, but not blood.

^z De fide et symbol., contr. Ad. xii. See also Abp. Wake’s Discourse in Gibson’s “Preservative against Popery,” Tit. vii. ch. 4. In Allix’s Treatise, “De Sanguine Christi,” S. Augustine is roundly rebuked for his hesitation on a point so essential to the Tridentine tenet.

Body, could the wine in the sacrament of the altar be transubstantiated into it^a?" S. Augustine did not think that it was; what he recognised in the chalice, was not living Blood, if such there be now flowing in the glorified Body of our Lord, but the Blood once shed for the remission of sins. This is the Blood by which He has entered into the Holy Place on high^b, and this alone finds place in the Eucharist below.

Now in this respect it is agreed that the Blood of Christ is represented, not contained, in the chalice, and the confession is fatal to the Tridentine dogma. The ministration of the cup was, and ever must be, a standing protest against it; for if whole Christ be given under one element, what can a second impart but a second Christ? This explains the pertinacity of the Roman Church in suppressing it, against its own sense of the words of consecration, the acknowledged usage of Catholic antiquity, and the earnest entreaty of some of her most devoted champions. On the other hand, as the cup was undoubtedly administered in all Churches for the first thousand years of the Christian era, it follows that "whole Christ" was not then believed to be "contained" in either element, though communicated spiritually in the faithful reception of both.

Lastly, as Jeremy Taylor has observed, these speculations are infinitely useless; they are altogether outside the sphere of the Eucharist. In whatever way Christ may be present, the virtue and benefit of the sacrament is to receive Him into the heart by faith, that He may dwell in us, and we in Him. The Council itself acknowledges the difference between

^a Allix, *sup.*

^b Heb. ix. 12.

sacramental and spiritual reception^c. To the latter these scholastic speculations afford no assistance whatever, since Christ is no nearer to the heart for being held in the hand or taken into the mouth. Many pressed and thronged Him upon earth, who never spiritually touched Him; whence S. Augustine finely says, *turba premit fides tangit*. Faith deals with that which is not seen, her sphere is beyond the things of sense, and whether we believe our living Lord to be contained corporally but invisibly in the sacrament, or only to effect by it an invisible but true Presence of Himself, it is faith alone that admits Him to the sanctuary of the heart, and by a Spiritual Presence only that He dwells in it.

In the early Church the sacramental action consisted of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of the Lamb of God, slain for the sins of the world; the spiritual benefit was to dwell in Christ and Christ in us. The Church believed with S. Paul that "if we have been planted together with Him in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection^d." In other words, to partake of the atonement made by His death is to be saved by His life^e. The Eucharist was called the food of immortality,

^c Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii. c. 8: "Quoad usum autem recte et sapienter patres nostri tres rationes hoc sanctum sacramentum accipiendi distinxerunt. Quosdam enim docuerunt *sacramentaliter* duntaxat id sumere, ut peccatores: alios tantum *spiritualiter*; illos nimirum qui voto propositum illum cœlestem panem edentes, fide viva quæ per dilectionem operatur, fructum ejus et utilitatem sentiunt: tertios porro *sacramentaliter simul et spiritualiter*; hi autem sunt qui ita se prius probant et instruunt ut vestem nuptialem induiti ad divinam hanc mensam accedant."

^d Rom. vi. 5.

^e Ibid.

because its due reception renewed and deepened our mystical union with Christ, the Resurrection and the Life. It was known that all grace and life are derived from the glorified Humanity of the Incarnate Mediator; but He was not identified with His gifts, nor held to be contained within the symbols of His Passion.

These rationalistic explanations degrade the mystery, and subvert the very nature of the sacrament. They make it one thing to the priest, and another to the communicant; they take away the cup which Christ gave for the communion of His Blood; they annihilate, by an intellectual fiction, the bread which Christ gave for the communion of His Body; they pretend to substitute Himself under the mere appearances, after abolishing His own means of receiving Him.

All this, begun in the hope of enriching the communion, ends in rendering communion one of the least valued uses of the sacrament. The singular excellence of the Eucharist, in comparison with other sacraments, is declared to be that, "whereas they acquire their sanctifying power in the use of them, the Author of all sanctity is in the Eucharist before it is used^f. Hence this sacrament is to be worshipped with the veneration due to God Himself; and none the less that our Lord instituted it to be received^g. It is to be honoured with public processions^h, reserved

^f Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii. cap. 3: "Reliqua sacramenta tunc primum sanctificandi vim habent quum quis illis utitur; at in Eucharistia ipse sanctitatis auctor ante usum est."

^g "Latræ cultum qui vero Deo debetur huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Neque enim ideo minus est adorandum quod fuerit a Christo Domino ut sumatur institutum."—Ibid., c. v. ^h Ibid.

in churchesⁱ; and though the Council earnestly exhorts to communion, it retains as an indispensable condition, the previous "sacramental confession" of mortal sins, save where no confessor can be found^k. Finally, it distinguishes three modes of receiving, *sacramentaliter* only, which is done by sinners; *spiritualiter* only, which is the benefit of those who eat the heavenly Bread in desire and faith without the sacrament; and *sacramentaliter simul et spiritualiter*, which is the privilege of the worthy communicant, and (we may add) the only true Scriptural use of the Institution.

Inconsistent as these decrees are with each other, they are followed by canons anathematizing all who presume to dissent from any. The audacity of such censures, in the face of the acknowledged Institution of Christ, and the universal practice of the first ages of Christianity, is a melancholy proof of the callousness induced by the arbitrary exercise of spiritual power. They remind us of the horrible blasphemies attributed to some of the popes of the previous century. They excuse, if they do not justify, the hard words of the early Reformers against the *bread-god* of the Papists; for these fictitious accretions had practically destroyed, and still greatly obscure, the one true purpose and blessing of the Holy Eucharist. They are everywhere recognised and observed throughout the Roman obedience; they are seen in all the streets and churches, they dominate in the thoughts of the people, they penetrate to the closets of the pious, and shew themselves daily in new superstitions. One thing is rare, and that

ⁱ Ibid., cap. vi.

^k Ibid., cap. vii.

is the one thing commanded by Christ. Christians are still everywhere agreed that, "the Body and Blood of Christ, are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." What destroys Catholic unity is, the perverse speculation which insists on defining what that is of which Christ said, "Take eat," when it is *not* eaten¹.

¹ It is not to be assumed that the doctrine of the Councils was generally prevalent within the Roman obedience before the Reformation. Archbishop Bramhall, in his *Answer to M. de la Mitière*, enumerates more than forty opinions with respect to the sacramental "conversion," some plainly contradictory of transubstantiation and concomitance. Dean Field, in the Appendix to his third *Book of the Church*, (ch. xvii.) quotes Cardinal Cajetan, saying, that while the novelty of conversion was affirmed by all in words, many denied it in fact. "Verum novitatem conversionis licet omnes voce affirmant, secundum rem tamen multi negaverunt, putantes se non negare illam." On this and other points the Dean maintains that the Western Churches generally before Luther were "true Protestant Churches;" meaning that they agreed with the Reformed Church of England more than the modern Church of Rome. This is proved at length in his Appendix.

CHAPTER V.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE change induced in the nature of the sacrament, by substituting the living Body for the Body and Blood of our Lord, produced a corresponding change in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In the undivided Church, and in the West before the Lateran Decree, the oblation was bread and wine, offered on the Holy Table for the use of the rite, and then consecrated by prayer and the words of Institution into the Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. The Sacrifice of the cross was first remembered before God by the appointed symbols, and then communicated to such as partook of them in faith and love. Hence the Fathers said,—

“We sacrifice by making remembrance of His death; we offer not another sacrifice like the High-Priest of old, but always the same; or rather, we celebrate a remembrance of that Sacrifice^a.”

By changing the symbols into the actual living Humanity of the Lord in glory, the sacrifice became a sensible oblation of His whole Person, not as He was when He suffered on the cross, but as He now is in heaven, in direct contradiction of the apostle (Heb. ix. 25), and of all primitive teaching. To make

^a Chrys. Hom. xvii., in Ep. ad Hebr. So Theophylact, App.

the case more desperate, this sacrifice of the living Christ is still offered in the two elements, which attest the separation of His Body and Blood in death.

The Church of Rome persists in asserting with S. Chrysostom, "We offer not another sacrifice, but the same," but she cannot repeat the qualification by which he guards the expression, "or rather we celebrate the memorial of that Sacrifice." It is not the memorial, but Christ Himself that is offered in the Mass; and this is another sacrifice, even if the oblation were the same. For sacrifice, (as Bellarmine says^b), is not a thing but an action; a repetition of the action is a repetition of the sacrifice.

The doctrine of the Western Church was certainly different a century before the Lateran Decree, when the Master of the Sentences wrote, in words adopted by Cranmer;—

"That which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is the memorial and representation of the True Sacrifice and holy immolation made on the altar of the Cross^c."

So Thomas Aquinas, shortly after the definition of Transubstantiation:—

"The celebration of this sacrament is aptly called the immolation of Christ; both because it is a sort of image of His Passion, and because by the sacrament we are made partakers of the fruits of the Passion^d."

^b "Nam non res illa sed rei illius oblatio proprie est sacrificium; sacrificium enim est actio non res permanens."—De Missâ, ii. 4.

^c Lomb. iv. Dist. 12.

^d Summ. iii. qu. 83, Art. 1.

The old doctrine asserts itself in the opening chapter even of the Tridentine Decree:—

“Forasmuch as the former Testament, as the apostle Paul is witness, made nothing perfect by reason of the infirmity of the Levitical priesthood, it was needful, by the ordinance of God the Father of mercies, that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedek, i.e. our Lord Jesus Christ, who is able to complete and bring to perfection all as many as were to be sanctified. He, therefore, our Lord and God, though He was to offer Himself once on the altar of the cross to God the Father, to accomplish there, by means of His death, our eternal redemption; yet since His priesthood was not to be extinguished by death, did in the Last Supper, in order to leave His Church a visible sacrifice to represent that one bloody oblation of the cross to the end of time, and apply its saving virtue to the remission of our daily recurring sins, offer to God the Father His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine, shewing Himself a High-Priest after the order of Melchisedek; and under the symbols of the same things gave them to be received by His apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament, and commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer likewise, saying, ‘This do in remembrance of Me,’ as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught. This is a new passover, instituted by Christ, that He Himself should be immolated by the Church through her priests under those visible signs, in remembrance of His passing out of this world to His Father, when He redeemed us by the effusion of His blood.” It is also the pure offering foretold by Malachi ^e, and alluded to by S. Paul to the Corinthians ^f; the same, too, “that was prefigured in the various similitudes of the sacrifices of nature and the law ^g.”

^e Mal. i. 11.

^f 1 Cor. x. 20, *seq.*

^g Sess. xxii. cap. 1.

Here it is acknowledged that the Eucharist is a visible sacrifice representing the one bloody oblation of the cross, and applying its saving virtue to the remission of particular sins. This is the doctrine of the Scripture, the Fathers, and the whole Catholic Church. That it was so ordained in the Institution at the Last Supper is universally acknowledged; but that Jesus Christ then offered it in His quality of Priest after the order of Melchisedek, and commanded His Apostles to do the same as His successors in that priesthood, are propositions of a different character; they are not easily accepted even by the Council of Trent.

A Portuguese divine said it could not be doubted that the Mass was a sacrifice, since all the Greek and Latin Fathers called it so; but that Christ offered Himself in the supper was not proved by the example of Melchisedek, or by the Paschal Lamb which was more plainly a type of the crucifixion. To the sacrifice of the cross also the words of Institution must be referred. The sacrifice in the Supper was a moot question in theology, which it was equally Catholic to assert or to deny. The Archbishop of Grenada was no less earnest to omit the passage, and rest the sacrifice on apostolical tradition; while the Bishop of Veglia insisted that to admit a propitiatory sacrifice in the Last Supper was to deny the ransom of the cross, since it was absurd to assert the Supper and the cross to be one and the same Sacrifice^b.

The theologians were nearly equally divided on the question, and at one time the Cardinal Legate de-

^b Paolo Sarpi, "History of the Council of Trent," book vi. 49.

terminated to omit the proposition. The Decree was finally ruled on the authority of S. Cyprian and other Fathers, who undoubtedly recognised a sacrifice in the Institution at the Last Supper. But these Fathers never dreamed of the Tridentine dogma of the Presence. They regarded the Institution of the Eucharist, like its after celebrations, as a symbolical offering of Christ's Death upon the cross. The bread and wine represented, but did not contain (as the Romanists themselves allow), His Body and Blood in the condition they were about to assume, when separated in death. Such a representation might be celebrated (like the first Passover) before the actual event, as well as after it. In taking and blessing the symbols, Christ was thought to have consecrated Himself to the Sacrifice they were designed to communicate; that was to offer His Body and Blood in the same sense that the apostles received them. There seems no necessity to confine the sacrifice to the moment of His death. The agony in the garden was included in the cup of His Passion; and in the solemn Institution of the Eucharist, He formally and spontaneously yielded Himself to the death, which by the hands of wicked men was inflicted soon after.

The Fathers who taught thus had no thought of two sacrifices, one in the Supper and another on the Cross; though the Bishop of Veglia with his notion of the Presence found it absurd to account them the same. If the visible oblation in both cases were the same, then indeed (as the bishop argued) Christ must have offered Himself twice; and we must

add, would be offered anew in every celebration of the Eucharist. But this consequence does not attach to the patristic view, in which the oblations were bread and wine, symbols of the slain Body and Blood, offered only to represent and plead that one death upon the cross.

In no other way, indeed, could the example of Melchisedek be at all applied to the Eucharist. The Fathers called it the "antitype" of the sacrifice which they supposed him to have made at his meeting with the father of the faithful. Being a priest, they inferred that he sacrificed; and as bread and wine are the only things mentioned, they assumed that these were the *oblata* that he presented. All this was only conjectured by way of analogy. The Scripture is silent in regard to any sacrifice by Melchisedek; the bread and wine are mentioned only as brought forth for the refreshment of his guests, and they were first applied by the early Fathers, as a shadow of the Eucharistic Communion. Then, because the elements were first offered in the Eucharist, later Fathers inferred they were similarly offered by Melchisedek, before their distribution to the guests. But this is inference, not Scripture,—matter of opinion, not of faith. The only priestly act recorded in the Scripture is the *blessing* of the father of the faithful. The Fathers *inferred* Melchisedek's oblation from their own; of the historical fact they knew no more than we do. That there was no apostolic tradition on the point is evident from the silence of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. When expressly treating on the Melchisedekian priesthood,

he makes no allusion whatever to the Eucharist, but represents it as commencing at the ascension, and having its sphere exclusively in heaven¹.

S. Jerome would account for this omission by the reserve which it was usual to employ, when speaking of the sacraments to the uninitiated; for he maintains that the Hebrews addressed were Jews and not Christians². The apostle, however, not only calls them "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling," but directs them to "Jesus the Apostle and High-Priest of their profession;" moreover, he distinctly alludes to the Christian altar, with other much deeper mysteries in relation to Melchisedek, than the supposed oblation of bread and wine.

Further, a sacrifice of bread and wine (if such a rite existed in the patriarchal age) would constitute no real distinction from the priesthood of Aaron, since fine flour and wine were common among the oblations of the law. Our Lord's priesthood in heaven is exercised by appearing within the veil, with the Blood shed upon the cross; it is the presentation in the holy place not made with hands of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God slain once for all. This is a bloody, not an unbloody, sacrifice. The superiority of the order of Melchisedek is nowhere rested on the absence of blood, but, as the apostle expressly states, on the eternity and singularity of the Priest, who is Himself the entire order.

It is idle, then, to argue from what is *not* stated in Scripture against what *is*. The Fathers, if they had been unanimous, could not make a type out of

¹ Heb. viii. 4.

² Ad Evagr., iii. 27.

a rite which is neither related in the Old Testament, nor expounded in the New. But the Fathers are not unanimous. S. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, have no mention of this type. It is not found among the numerous similitudes of Barnabas and Hermas. Irenæus is ignorant of it; and Justin Martyr, who ransacked the Old Testament for types, and found the Eucharist in the law and in the prophets, never lighted upon it in the more obvious symbols of Melchisedek.

The first to apply the incident to the Eucharist was Clement of Alexandria, who limits the type to the *communion*^k. Tertullian neither speaks of sacrifice^l, nor refers to the Eucharist. Origen, the most learned Hebraist of all, supposed Melchisedek to be an angel, and knew nothing of his sacrifice. S. Cyprian is the first to adduce it as a type of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. After him it was held by Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome, and so passed into a common opinion. It was never inserted, however, in the Liturgies or decrees of faith till the Council of Trent, and there it was long stoutly denied^m. Jeremy Taylor admits it, but Bishop Andrewes con-

^k "Melchisedek, King of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who gave bread and wine, furnishing consecrated food for a type of the Eucharist."—*Strom.*, iv. 25. Some may think sacrifice to be implied in the word consecrated.

^l "Melchisedek ipsi Abrahæ, jam circumciso, revertenti de prælio panem et vinum obtulit incircumcisos."—*Adv. Jud.* iii. But Abram was not then circumcised, see Gen. xvii.

^m Fra Paolo mentions an *anthem* which asserted it; but we have still too much experience how often such compositions contradict the doctrine of the Church.

fidently determines of Melchisedek, "sacrificium nulum obtulit".

Be the fact, however, as it may, the Fathers who adduced this type undoubtedly supposed the oblation which our Lord made in the Eucharist, to be bread and wine, as symbols of His Body and Blood. S. Cyprian expressly says that "He offered the same thing which Melchisedek had offered, that is bread and wine—to wit, His Body and Blood." He calls Melchisedek's oblation "an image of Christ's sacrifice constituted in bread and wine," and says, "the Lord fulfilled the type when He offered the bread and the cup." S. Augustine adds the testimony of the Latin Church:—

"The priesthood and sacrifices of Aaron are now nowhere to be found, and everywhere under Christ the High-Priest is offered that which Melchisedek brought forth when he blessed Abram".

What these Fathers say is, that our Lord offered the same things that Melchisedek offered, viz., bread and wine, as symbols of the sacrifice of the cross. The identity of the material oblation is the whole and sole force of the type. And for the same reason the pure offering (*mincha*) of Malachi was still earlier and more generally interpreted of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

² *De Decimis Theologica Determinatio*.—"Decimas non spontaneas sed de jure debitas: iterum jam quæro *de jure*, quo jure? non sacrificii, nullum enim obtulit; benedictionis ergo; cohærent enim ista, benedicit Melchisedek, decimas pendit Abram."

• Ep. lxii. (Oxford Ed. lxiii.) ad Cæc.

² *De Civ. Dei*, xvii. 17.

To part with the bread and wine is to part with all the Fathers, no less than with the Institution of Christ. This separation, however, is still further widened in the next chapter:—

“And since in this Divine sacrifice performed in the Mass the same Christ is contained, and unbloodily immolated, who on the altar of the cross once offered Himself with blood, the holy synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and *of itself* effectual that we may obtain grace and help in time of need, if with a true heart and right faith, with fear and reverence, in contrition and penitence we draw near to God. For the Lord being appeased by this oblation, granting grace and the gift of repentance, forgives offences and sins however great. For it is one and the same Victim, now offering the same thing by the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner of the offering only being different. The fruits of which bloody oblation are most abundantly participated by this unbloody offering; so far is it, that in any way by this any derogation is done to that. Wherefore, it is properly offered according to the tradition of the apostles, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful living, but for the dead in Christ not yet fully purified¹.”

This chapter omits the Body and Blood altogether. The bread and wine have now become Christ Himself; in offering them the priest, or rather Christ by his ministry, offers the same Victim that died on the cross, but in a different manner; and further, this offering is propitiatory. This epithet might mean that the propitiation of the cross is *applied* in the Eucharist, but

¹ Trid. Conc., Sess. xxii. cap. 2.

the words, *vere propitiatorium esse per ipsumque fieri*, seem to shut out this explanation. The different manner of the unbloody sacrifice no longer means, as the Fathers meant, that the bloody sacrifice was real and efficacious, and the unbloody one is symbolical and instrumental. It is alleged to be the same Victim, not in sacrament, but in very Person: the same sacrifice is offered, and to the same purpose and effect, though in a different manner. It is insisted at all hazards that the cross and its commemoration are one and the same *Sacrifice*. The two *oblata* which represent the two parts of the dead Christ are also each of them really and literally His living Person. These statements display an intrepidity of contradiction, which is sometimes mistaken for the enunciation of a mystery.

It is a contradiction in terms to say that a sacrifice, continually repeated in thousands of places, is the same sacrifice with one, of which the distinguishing characteristic is that it was offered once for all upon the cross;—that an unbloody sacrifice is the same with a bloody one;—and a representative one the same with that which it represents and applies. If it were true that both Victim and Offerer were the same, yet a repetition of the *act* would constitute another sacrifice; and a *difference* in the action, or manner of offering, makes a different sacrifice, “since it is not the thing, but the offering of the thing, which is properly the sacrifice.” It is a further contradiction in terms to call a sacrifice unbloody, in which one of the things offered is the actual Blood of Christ;

¹ *De Miss.*, ii. 4.

for blood cannot be offered after an unbloody manner, unless it be in figure or by representation.

These are only a few of the contradictions which result from identifying the Body and Blood of Christ crucified with the living Person of Christ glorified. It is admitted that the sacrament represents the sacrifice of Christ's Death. It exhibits His Body and Blood sundered in two elements, as in the hour when the one hung lifeless on the cross, and the other lay poured upon the ground below. Now, if it were true that these—whether by transubstantiation or otherwise—could be corporally and substantially contained in or under the sacrament, yet they are not "whole Christ." The Soul was certainly then absent from the Body, in Paradise. And though we believe the Divinity of the Word to have remained united to each by hypostatic union, even when the vital union was dissolved, yet there is no hypostatic union with bread and wine. Hence, neither can the Divinity of Christ be contained in the sacrament. Transubstantiation itself could result in nothing but a *dead* Christ, and that to no purpose. The Lord is risen: His Body and Blood are no longer in the state of death in fact, and they can only be so in the sacrament by remembrance and representation.

Hence it is, that in *partaking* of them we partake of His life*. The living Manhood of Jesus Christ in heaven is the channel of all grace and life to men; and the object and result of the Holy Eucharist is to incorporate us more and more into Him, who is the First-fruits from the dead. But means are not iden-

* S. John vi. 54.

tical with the end. Christ's Flesh is meat indeed, and His Blood is drink indeed. Meat and drink, however, are not life, but the nourishment and means of life; the Flesh of Christ crucified is the means, Christ glorified is the life itself. The sacrament exhibits the means by way of representation and symbol; for this it is indispensable to retain bread and wine; *there is no sacrament without them*. In *receiving* these, we receive indeed "whole Christ," in spirit and in faith; but it is a clumsy contradiction to put the unseen reality in the place of the visible element;—to make the same object, at the same instant, bread and not bread—the symbol of Christ slain, and the Person of Christ risen.

The chapter closes with the assertion that—

"the Mass is properly (*rite*) offered according to the tradition of the apostles, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other needs of living believers, but for the departed in Christ not being yet fully purified."

The Council authorizes its celebration "in honour and memory of the saints[†]," declares the Roman canon to be *ab omni errore purum*[‡], and enjoins the secret pronunciation of the words of consecration (*submissa voce*), together with the mystic benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, to be all of apostolic discipline and tradition^{*}.

The sixth chapter pronounces for solitary Masses (in which the priest alone communicates) as—

"properly public, partly because the people communicate *spiritualiter*, and partly because they are celebrated by the

[†] Cap. iii.

[‡] Cap. iv.

^{*} Cap. v.

public minister of the Church for all the faithful who belong to the body of Christ'."

The eighth prohibits the use of the vulgar tongue, with a proviso for retaining the ancient rite of every Church if approved by the Roman "mother and mistress of all Churches," and for pastoral explanation to the people of the mystery of the sacrifice^r. The Canons (as usual) anathematize all dissentients, and among them,—

"whoever shall say that the sacrifice of the Mass is only an action of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice finished on the cross, and not propitiatory, or only profitable to the actual receiver, and not to be offered for the living and the dead, for their sins, pains, satisfactions, and other needs^s."

These anathemas are levelled at the leading tenets of the Reformation. They were directed (among others) against the forty-two English Articles of 1552, and the challenge was responded to in the promulgation of our present Thirty-nine Articles, six months after the Tridentine Decree^b.

Wading through its cloud of contradictions as best we may, the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now held in the Church of Rome, is found to maintain the following propositions:—

1. That under each consecrated element is contained

^r Cap. vi.

^s Cap. viii.

^a Can. iii.

^b The Session *de Sacrificio Missæ* (xxii.), was held on September 17, 1562. The Thirty-nine Articles were subscribed in Latin on January 29 following, i.e. 1562 *old style*. The date alone disposes of Sancta Clara's notion, that Article XXXI. is aimed at some vulgar errors which were corrected by the Council of Trent.

the glorified Body and Blood, with the Soul and Divinity, of our Blessed Lord, in a spiritual immaterial way.

2. That the natural substance of the Bread and Wine is displaced, or annihilated, by consecration, so that only the "forms" or accidents remain; that this conversion or transubstantiation continues so long as the "forms" remain entire, and constitutes the sacrament, to all intents and purposes, the Person of Christ.

3. That in the oblation of the Host, the whole living Person of Christ is really sacrificed, not in the same manner, but to the same effect as on the cross, it being indeed one and the same Sacrifice.

4. That this Sacrifice is available to the absent and the dead, and that by those who communicate, worthily or unworthily, Christ is received whole in the Host; so that the cup is superfluous, and may be withdrawn.

5. That the consecrated Host, whether in the oblation, the communion, or otherwise, while remaining undissolved by natural decay, is to be worshipped with the worship due to God Himself.

These astounding propositions are all evolved from the so-called literal sense of the four words, *hoc est corpus meum*, excluding the *quod pro vobis datur*, and the *sanguinem qui pro vobis effunditur*, which define their true meaning in the Vulgate. On this purely rationalistic ground, without one explicit statement of ancient authority, and in the face of the distinct contradiction of all the Liturgies, they are dogmatically delivered as part of the apostolic tradition and the

constant persuasion of the Catholic Church. To add to our amazement, the chief Divines of the Church of Rome assert, alongside of this "literal interpretation," another which is purely symbolical. They say that when spoken of the slain Body and the outshed Blood, the *hoc est* does *not* effect a conversion, but a representation. But this *is* the meaning, and the only possible meaning, of the words of consecration, and there are no others to effect the conversion. The Tridentine Presence is not asserted till *after* the consecration, and then what is there to effect it? What is it, we ask, that converts the acknowledged symbols of the sundered Body and Blood into the real living Person of Christ? The answer is, not the sacramental consecration, but the supposed physical "concomitance" of the glorified Body in heaven*. It is to be observed, however, that in the Institution of the Eucharist there was no possible room for this imagination. The Body and Blood of Christ then remained united in His living Person; as He gave them in the Sacrament, there was no union of them in either element. He did not first consecrate both, and then distribute as in the Church's Liturgies, but the bread was broken, given, and *eaten*, before the cup was blessed. The sacrament of the Flesh was disposed of, before the sacrament of the Blood came into existence. Consecration, distribution,

* See the Catechism: "Since to the Body are united the Blood, Soul, and Divinity, all these also will be in the sacrament, not, indeed, by virtue of the consecration, but as united to the Body; and these things are said to be in the sacrament by concomitance, in which manner it is clear that in the sacrament is contained Christ, whole and entire."

—*Cat. Conc. Trid.*, part ii. cap. iv. question 32.

and communion were, in fact, one act, of which (as has been well said) "the several parts overlapped each other^d." There was no moment of time to which the theory of "concomitance" could apply: none in which the two parts of the sacrament were on the Table together: none in which the Tridentine Presence could be possible: none in which the oblation of the Mass existed; and, therefore, none in which it could be either offered or adored. These startling dogmas are all crowded into an interval, which had absolutely no existence in the original Institution.

The apostle also regards the oblation and the communion as one, and without separation of parts, when he says, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till He come." The eating and drinking are component parts of the "shewing," i.e. of the oblation.

So taught S. Augustine; indeed, there is no escape from this indivisible unity in Scripture or antiquity. The oblation ascribed to our Lord's action in the Institution consisted in His taking, blessing, and giving thanks, all which preceded the utterance of the words to which the conversion of the elements is now ascribed; and unless we are prepared to receive the *dictum* of Bellarmine, that these words were spoken *twice*—another instance of opposing Scripture by what is not in Scripture—it is certain that what Christ

^d See the Rev. W. Milton's "Eucharistic Doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church," a publication quoted from memory in my first edition, when I had lost my copy, and could not refer to the title of this able treatise.

"offered" was (as S. Cyprian says) bread and wine, in signification of His Body and Blood. Remembering further that each was offered and *communicated* separately, the Tridentine view is absolutely inconceivable. It not only requires Christ to take His whole Body into a part of it (while it was not yet glorified), and give it to the disciples while He still stood before them; but it obliges Him to perform this miracle, first of His Flesh severed from His Blood, and then of His Blood separate from His Flesh, while all the time the two remained united in His Body before their eyes. These positions are outside the sphere of doctrine or faith. They cannot be revealed to man, because they are simply unthinkable.

The separation of the sacrifice from the Communion has thrown the Roman Catholic divines into much perplexity in defining wherein the sacrifice consists. The Tridentine Decree and the present missal seem to place it in the oblation of the Host. Thomas Aquinas expressly teaches that "the sacrifice is finished before the fraction of the Host, and the receiving properly belongs to the sacrament, but the oblation to the sacrifice ^e."

This would make the oblation *precede* the consecration, which is the uniform order of the ancient Liturgies; whence, again, the things offered must be bread and wine, not Christ or His Body and Blood ^f.

^e "Docuisse Thomam sacrificium ante fractionem hostiæ esse perfectum, sumptionemque spectare proprie ad sacramentum, oblationem vero ad sacrificium."—*Can. Loc. Theol.*, xii. 833. *Gibson's Pres. against Popery*, ii. 79.

^f In the Roman Missal the bread is not broken during the recital of

Bossuet, with Suarez and Vasquez, place the sacrifice in the consecration itself, but Bellarmine and Melchior Canus rightly include the *manducation*, without which it is certain that no sacrifice of peace-offerings was ever complete. All these logically exclude non-communicants from any part in the sacrifice; but this, though in strict accordance with the primitive Church, is in opposition to the Tridentine Decree.

The struggles of these writers shew the burden laid on the intellect and conscience of the Church by the huge mass of undigested scholasticism adopted by the Council of Trent. The Bishop of Meaux tells us that the sacrifice (apart from the communion) contains

“a threefold oblation; 1. of bread and wine; 2. of the Body and Blood (i.e. the whole Person) of Christ; 3. of the body mystical, the Church. The first is the subject of the oblation before the consecration; the second, of the oblation after it. The substance of the bread and wine are then consumed by the fire of the Holy Ghost, and the Body of Christ succeeds in its place, by a kind of production, as true and real as at the moment of His conception of the Virgin Mary.”

the words of Institution, but only after the consecration is finished. Sir William Palmer says this was the ancient use at Constantinople and Cæsarea, as well as at Rome and Milan, and the fraction was in preparation for the Communion. The old Alexandrian Liturgy (like our own) had a previous fraction at the repetition of the Words. The later fraction becomes unmeaning when there is no communion; but it is easy to see how it serves the modern notion of sacrificing Christ Himself.—(See Palmer's *Orig. Liturg.*, iv. 19.)

“Une espèce de production aussi véritable, et aussi réelle, que celle qui fut faite dans la bienheureux sein de Marie, au moment de la conception et de l'incarnation du Fils de Dieu;—production qui lui donne en quelque façon un *nouvel être*, par lequel il est sur la sainte Table aussi véritablement qu'il a été dans le sein de la Vierge, et qu'il est main-

This is the 'making of Christ's Body;' that which places it before the Father, and therefore the essence of the sacrifice. To this pertain the elevation and the fraction, though the communion is also an oblation, since it is the consumption of the sacrifice.

Bellarmino, too, accounts the destruction of the bread and wine in transubstantiation to be of the essence of the sacrifice. This really limits the sacrifice to the bread and wine, since nothing else is *destroyed*, either in the conversion or the communion. Could Bossuet seriously believe that the priest gives a "new being" to Christ in the consecration, or that His whole Person is *consumed* in the communion? Such explanations only confirm the two great canons of Scripture and the Catholic Church, that there is no sacrament without the continuance of bread and wine, and no participation in the Eucharistic Sacrifice without eating and drinking them. The oblation and manducation are concurrent parts of the sacrifice, or rather manducation (as Bossuet admits) is oblation, while oblation without manducation is nothing. The Tridentine sacrifice is, in fact, the converse of the old Catholic Eucharist. It chains the Person of Christ to the elements in all that He has *not* commanded, and doubts about it in the one thing needful. Christ is in the Host *so long as it is not eaten*, but from that

tenant dans le ciel."—*Explication de quelques difficultes sur les prieres de la Messe*. But is this "quelque façon" seriously taught as an article of faith? The Son of God was made flesh "of the substance of His mother," and that flesh He retains in heaven. Whence comes the "substance" of the "nouvel être" which the priest gives to him in the Mass? And what becomes of it when the rite is concluded? It remains indeed in the Host which is *not* eaten, but what of that which is?

which is duly received He vanishes, no one can tell when, or whither!

On the whole, the Tridentine doctrine cannot be absolved from the heavy censure of the Church of England; that it "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions^h." It is rooted and grounded in *materialism*,—the fruitful parent of all idolatry. A material Presence was sought to add reality to the communion, but the effect was to discourage communion and substitute adoration, with other purposes *extra usum sacramenti*. The Church, in the very spirit of Paganism, imagined herself to be possessed of an object that could please God, and atone for sin. She proceeded to make use of it for departed souls as well as for the living; prescribing her own terms, and determining the price of her masses, as maker and owner. Be it far from us to say she has forsaken the Cross, in the true faith of which so many thousands have lived and died within the Roman obedience. In all Churches a loving faith in Christ triumphs over mistaken polemics. But we do charge a chief part of the dissensions which divide and hinder Christianity, and of the superstitions which deform it, on the material Presence, and the impossible Sacrifice, of the Mass.

^h Article XVIII.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LUTHERAN HYPOTHESIS.

THE Eucharistic teaching of Martin Luther, and the Protestant Confession of Augsburg, is distinguished by the name of Consubstantiation^a. Its peculiarity lies in uniting the Corporal Presence to the elements without conversion of substance: hence it is also called the “co-existent” theory.

“It is true bread (Luther wrote) and true wine, in which are the true Flesh and true Blood of Christ, no otherwise and no less than they (the Romanists) place them under the accidents. That the true Flesh and Blood may be in the sacrament, it is not necessary that the bread and wine be transubstantiated, and Christ be contained under the accidents. But both remaining together, it is truly said, ‘This bread is My Body, this wine is My Blood;’ and the contrary. Now what we hold is, that the Body is so in the bread, that with the bread in very truth it is eaten, and whatever motion or action the bread receives, the same also has the Body of Christ; so that the Body of Christ is truly said to be carried, given, received, eaten, when the bread is carried, given, received, or eaten: that is the force of ‘This is My Body.’ . . . Behold fire and iron, two substances; they are so mixed in heated iron that every part is both iron and fire.

^a According to Mosheim, Consubstantiation was substituted for Transubstantiation in a treatise by John of Paris, surnamed the *Pungens Asinus*, towards the end of the thirteenth century. — *Eccl. Hist.*, Cent. xiii. part 2. This treatise, which certainly denies Transubstantiation, was reprinted at London A.D. 1686, and is included in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*, tom. iii.

Why cannot much more the glorious Body of Christ so be in every part of the substance of the bread? The Body of Christ is in the sacrament without injury to the bread, as the fire is in the iron without injury to the substance of iron, and God in man without prejudice to the humanity; the two substances being everywhere so mixed that each retains its own operation and proper nature, and yet constitute a certain one thing^b."

The illustration changes sides in the light of modern science, which considers heat to be not another substance, but a mode or condition of the iron itself. Luther meant that the Body existed together with the bread under the same material limits; and in token of it he long retained the elevation of the Host for adoration at Wittenberg. This practice is said to continue among high Lutherans, though disapproved by the other leaders of the German Reformation.

The Lutheran view acknowledges the reception of Christ by the unworthy communicant, though to condemnation; and the adoration, not of the sacrament, but of Christ in the sacrament. On the other hand, it maintains the continuance of bread and wine, and insists on the administration of the cup.

Some further abuses are guarded against by attributing the consecration to the prayer of the Church, instead of the priest's utterance of the words of Institution; and above all, by the great Protestant canon,—cited and accepted by Bishop Cosin,—that a sacrament has no sacramental effect beyond the use assigned to it in the Divine Institution. "*Nihil*

^b Luther against Henry VIII.

habet rationem sacramenti, extra usum seu actionem divinitus institutam ^c."

The Presence is restrained to the time of celebration; which Luther defined to be from the Lord's Prayer and the words of Institution, till all had communicated in both kinds, consumed the remains, and left the altar. He allowed no Presence but in communion, citing 1 Cor. x. 16, as importing that the Body is present only in the breaking and eating. In fact, the words of Institution are recited among the Lutherans during the distribution, not in the consecration, as in the Catholic Liturgies.

Luther rested his doctrine, as the Romanists rest theirs, on the literal force of the words of Institution; but in fact, as often happens in disjoining the text of Scripture from the Catholic teaching, his interpretation is *further* from the letter than any other. The words of Institution may mean, This is My Body in *substance*, or in *effect*, or in *figure*; as the words, "this is my estate" may denote the land itself, or the value of it, or the title - deeds, or a drawing or plan of the property, according to the nature of the object indicated by the pronoun "this." But on the Lutheran hypothesis the bread is *not* the Body, but accompanies the Body; this is in direct contradiction to the words of Institution.

^c Form. Concord., Art. vii. de Cœna Dom. Pfaff de Cons. Vet. Euch., xv. "As we also deny that the elements still retain the nature of sacraments when not used according to the Divine Institution, that is, given by Christ's ministers and received by His people; so that Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants."—Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation," iii. 5.

The hypothesis involves the further difficulty of presenting *two* objects to the adoration of the attendants instead of one;—a snare which the schoolmen hoped to escape by the invention of transubstantiation. For, although the Lutherans profess to worship, not the sacrament, but “Christ in the sacrament,” yet if the two are united in one thing, it is impossible to exhibit external homage to one, without doing the same to the other. On this point, as on some others, the Lutheran practice seems to have wavered; certainly the adoration might be consistently rejected on the principle of *nil extra usum divinitus institutum*.

The same remark applies to the unworthy receiving, than which nothing could be more foreign to the Divine Institution. Olshausen, himself a Lutheran, denies that 1 Cor. xi. 27 implies a reception of Christ by the wicked; and the better opinion was always, that the Presence is withdrawn from the sacrament when it touches the lips of the unworthy^d.

Luther insisted on the ministration of the cup, from the express words of Institution, against which no debate is allowable^e; still it is absolutely contra-

^d See Palmer's "Treatise of the Church," quoted in Pusey's "Letter to Bishop of London," p. 66.

^e "Etsi non negamus, quin totus Christus tam pane, quam vino Eucharistiæ dispensatur, tamen docemus usum utriusque partis debere Ecclesiæ universum esse. Manifestum enim est quod Christus ipse, nihil periculis quæ postea humana superstitione excogitata sunt aut aliis commentis deterritus, tradiderit Ecclesiæ utramque partem utendam. Manifestum etiam est quod vetus Ecclesia usa sit utraque parte multis annis. Et testantur aliquot scriptores perspicue eos qui solum panem accipiunt non accipere plenum sacramentum sacramentaliter, sic enim loquuntur, et divisionem unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacri-

dictory to that view of the Presence which he retained from the Latin schoolmen. If whole Christ be in the bread, what more can be conveyed in the cup? And if Christ be whole in each, why are two separate elements presented to the communicant? These questions are quite as fatal to the Lutheran as to the Tridentine hypothesis.

The same error obliged him to explain away the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as a metaphor. He could allow no oblation of the *consecrated* elements, without going back to the abomination of the Mass; and he discarded the oblation before consecration, (though undoubtedly primitive,) as a needless ceremony, that might encourage superstition. Prayer and praise he conceived, with Bellarmine, to be no true sacrifice; he could not dissociate the word from the unscriptural notion of an actual gift to God. Christ was not to be sacrificed a second time, and God had no need of bread and wine, which in fact He did not consume. The great Reformer apparently never asked himself in what sense God needed or consumed the sacrifices of the Old Testament, nor why a visible sacrament of an invisible sacrifice, might not be equally offered in the New? The learned Lutheran, Pfaff, candidly acknowledges that an oblation of bread and wine, before the consecration, was anciently practised, and even by Apostolical ordinance; but he denies it to be a sacrifice, and thinks the usage was neither universal nor necessary. He takes it only

legio fieri non posse."—Confession of Wirtemberg, Art. xix. The Confession of Augsburg (Art. xxii.), rests the cup simply and briefly on the *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, of Matt. xxvi.

as a symbol of the self-sacrifice of the Church, excluding the mystic reference to the sacrifice of the cross. These views flow naturally enough from the singular and unprimitive theory of the Lutheran Presence: as a re-action and protest against the Mass, it attracted the first attention of our own Reformers, and Cranmer seems at one time to have been inclined to embrace it. The incongruity, however, of two substances united in one visible sacrament was quickly perceived, and the hypothesis never gained acceptance in any school of English divines. Even in Germany, the great authority of Luther could not command the consent of his own followers.

The corporal Presence was questioned by not a few of those who subscribed the first Confession of Augsburg. The Tridentine phrase, "under the forms of bread and wine," retained in the original German, disappeared from the authorized Latin version of 1531; and the strongest statement left, asserting a Real Presence in *reception*, is compared by Pfaff to the teaching of our own Church Catechism.

The revised Confession of Melancthon substitutes the word "exhibited" for "present;" and notwithstanding the effort made in the misnamed *Formula Concordiæ* to restore the high Lutheran view, it has everywhere yielded to Calvinist and Zwinglian interpretations. According to a late eminent authority, hardly any genuine Lutherans are now to be found in Germany¹.

Calvin and Zwingli both agreed with Luther in denying any change of substance in the sacrament,

¹ Dr. Dollinger's "Church and the Churches."

and in rejecting sacrifice as one of the shadows of the law. All three held communion to be the sole use of the sacrament; the difference between them was in the *modus operandi*. Luther invested the elements with a corporal Presence, but solely in order to spiritual union in partaking of them; Zwingle, on the contrary, regarded them as "bare signs," suggestive of faith and love to the receiver, but in themselves incapable of being means of grace^c.

Calvin steered a middle course, which for that reason alone would be sure to find favour in England, while our own *via media* was being traced. He conceived the elements to acquire by consecration the power or virtue of promoting the union of true believers with Christ's Glorified Humanity.

"The Body is truly and efficiently exhibited, but not naturally. By which we mean, not that the very substance of His Body, or that the real and natural Body of Christ is there given, but all the benefits which Christ procured for us in His Body. This is that presence of His Body which the nature of a Sacrament requires^b."

Again :—

"The Body of Christ is really, as they commonly speak,

^c This is the teaching so decidedly rejected in our twenty-seventh Homily, Part I. Abp. Wake apologizes for Zwingle as erring in expression rather than meaning: and Waterland says his followers came into truer notions, and left the low theory of naked signs to the Anabaptists and Socinians, (Review, ch. vii.) On the other hand, Dr. Vogan has shewn that Socinus claimed Zwingle, though not with perfect success. He adds that the doctrines of Zwingle and Limborch, of Socinus and the so-called Unitarians, and of English dissenters generally, are all cast in the same mould.—("True Doctrine of the Eucharist," 1871, p. 543.)

^b Inst., ap. Waterland, ch. vii.

that is, truly given to us in the Supper. If in the fraction of the bread the Lord truly represented the participation of His Body, it certainly should not be doubted that He truly presents and exhibits it. The sum is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are united to the bread and wine sacramentally, that to believers Christ may be truly exhibited. The word "united" is used, because the Flesh is exhibited and received at one and the same moment (*semel et simul*) with the bread, and the Blood with the wine¹."

Calvin's view has been disparaged as a virtual Presence; but virtue, force, or energy, is the genuine proof of spiritual Presence. Waterland thinks the French reformer "came very near the truth, and the whole truth." It was not in Waterland, however, to cite any author, ancient or modern, without improving his language. He suggests that there "was an ambiguity of which Calvin was not aware;" he ought to have said, "the natural Body is there given, but *is not there present*, which is what he really meant." Probably Calvin knew his own meaning best. Certainly this is not the meaning of the "virtual Presence" held by other writers ancient and modern, who strongly assert its reality. The ambiguity (if any) arises from Calvin's neglecting to distinguish between the "Body and Blood" of the Cross, and the "Body" of Christ in heaven². This we must return to hereafter.

¹ In Comment. ad 1 Cor., apud Cosin, Hist. Trans.

² Like the majority of the controversialists of his time, Calvin was too much occupied with confuting the Tridentine Presence, to pay proper attention to the primitive teaching and the force of the words of Institution, as exhibiting the crucified, not the glorified Body. In the

It may be needless to remark, that neither Luther nor Calvin were ever accepted as authorities on this subject by the Church of England. Both have been quoted, like other doctors, by our divines, but few have professed entire accordance with either; and Luther's hypothesis is certainly included under our formal repudiation of the Corporal Presence. As there appears, however, to be some disposition at present to revive the "co-existent" theory under a new aspect, it is important to give some consideration to the elaborations of the Lutheran divines.

They repudiate the term *Consubstantiation*, as implying *fusion*, whereas what they assert is the "sacramental union" of the Body and bread, each retaining its own nature distinct. The *Formula Concordiæ* lays it down that—

"The Body and Blood of Christ are taken not only spiritually and by faith, but also with the mouth; not *capere-naturaliter*, but after a supernatural and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union with the bread and wine."

It even disclaims the word *corporal*, insisting only that the Body is truly, though spiritually, present¹. Bellarmine uses exactly the same language of the Roman hypothesis: the Body is really present, but spiritually, or after the manner of a spirit, i.e. without matter, form, colour, weight, &c. This language might correctly describe a mystical Presence of Christ crucified in the elements, or a spiritual Presence of Christ

latter condition, the Presence is really virtual; in the other, it is also mystical, or sacramental; and both are real.

¹ Pfaff, de Cona, xvii.

glorified in the soul; but the Romanists and Lutherans use it, to assert the Presence of our Lord's glorified Body in the material sacrament; this confounds the essential distinction between body and spirit, and goes to deny the reality of Christ's Body altogether.

In like manner the phrase, "sacramental union," might properly describe a spiritual union of the *power and efficacy* of Christ's Body and Blood with the visible sacrament, which is the Real Presence of Catholic antiquity. But in the mouth of a Lutheran, this phrase implies a union of the *substance* of Christ's glorified Body with the bread and wine. Gerhard explains it in this way:—

"We believe that in the sacrament of the Eucharist there is a true, real, and *substantial* presence, exhibition, eating and drinking, of Christ's Body and Blood; which Presence is not an essential conversion of the bread into the Body, and of the wine into the Blood of Christ, which they call transubstantiation;—neither is it a local or permanent affixion of the Body to the bread, and of the Blood to the wine;—neither is it a personal union of the bread and the Body, such as is the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ;—neither is it a local inclusion of the Body in the bread;—neither is it impanation or incorporation into bread;—neither is it consubstantiation, by which the bread coalesces in one physical mass with the Body, and the wine with the Blood;—neither is it natural inexistence, or hiding of a corpuscle under the bread; nor any carnal or physical thing of this kind. But it is a sacramental Presence and union, which is so effected, that to the bread and wine, when blessed according to the institution of our most true, wise, and omnipotent Saviour, as to a medium thereunto

divinely ordained, the Body and Blood of Christ are united, in a manner incomprehensible to us, so that in a sublime mystery we take, eat, and drink, by one sacramental eating and drinking, the Body of Christ with that bread, and His Blood with that wine. In short, it is not absence (*ἀπουσίαν*), not inexistence (*ἐνουσίαν*), not consubstantiation (*συνουσίαν*), not transubstantiation (*μετουσίαν*), but the Presence (*παρουσίαν*) of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we declare in the Supper^m."

This elaborate exposition obviates some objections, and might leave little controversy, if the words "Body and Blood" were allowed to retain their scriptural and proper application to the *crucified* Body and Blood *shed* for our sins. These are indeed "sacramentally united" to the bread and wine, and "in a sublime mystery" eaten and drunk by the faithful communicant. But they are not contained in the sacrament, nor physically joined to it, but represented by it. Moreover the Lutheran, like the Roman hypothesis, refers to another condition of the Body and Blood, which is not represented in the sacrament. It confounds the *substance* of Christ's Body in heaven with the sacramental operation of His Body and Blood on the cross.

The objections to this error are certainly mitigated by the Protestant canon of *nihil extra usum*, on which Pfaff observes that—

"There is no sacrament in the Old or New Testament which does not consist in action; and it is not the baptismal water which is properly called the sacrament, but rather the

^m Pfaff, de Cons., xvii.

action by which the baptism is performed². Moreover, the very words of Institution restrain the Real Presence to the use and whole action; For Christ said, 'this is My Body, this is My Blood,' after He had said, 'eat,' 'drink,' to shew that His Body would not be present, but in the use and action which He Himself prescribed. . . . Hence, in our churches, the words, 'this is the Body of Jesus Christ,' are said only in the act of distribution and reception."

This view he supports from 1 Cor. x. 16, on which Luther's comment is—

"When we distribute and eat the bread, then we receive and eat not mere bread, but also the Body of Christ."

Referring, further, to the Canon of the Mass, in the petition, "that they may be made *to us* the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son," Pfaff acutely insists that the pronoun *nobis* indicates the Real Presence to be vouchsafed only in the use³.

These explanations bring the Lutheran doctrine into closer accordance with Calvin's: the followers of both learned (as our own Reformers expected they would) to qualify the first utterances of the re-action against popery by a more careful discrimination. It is observable that both, as they acquired a truer conception of the Presence, exhibited also higher views of the Sacrifice. Still the "co-existent" hypothesis cannot be freed from the great fault of a corporal and mechanical Presence. Practically, as held by

² This double use of the word "sacrament," no less than of "sacrifice" and "Eucharist," is always to be borne in mind.

³ Pfaff, *Diss. de Cons. Vet. Euch.*

moderate Lutherans, it may differ little from Hooker's *dictum*, "that the Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." Each regards the Sacramental Presence as a means to the Spiritual Presence in the communicant; each recoils from the Tridentine fiction of a deified Host, with which communion is the last thing sought for, which is offered to the adoration of non-communicants, and even sacrificed for souls no longer in the flesh. But the English divine saw the danger of the Lutheran hypothesis in other directions.

To locate Christ's glorified Body in the elements *along with* bread and wine, is not less injurious to a right faith in the Incarnation, than to imagine it in the paten and the cup *instead* of them. That Body (our Church affirms) "is in heaven, and not here;" whatever glory it has acquired in the exaltation, it is still a real human Body; and of all bodies the distinguishing characteristic, as opposed to spirit, is that they are bounded by form and place. Hence it is "against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." This capital heresy is not avoided by saying the Presence is immaterial, spiritual, supernatural, or superlocal. Multiply epithets as it may, the "co-existent" teaching cannot escape the censure, which Hooker urges from S. Augustine: "that majestic Body, which we make to be everywhere present, doth thereby cease to have the substance of a true Body ^p."

As for Scripture and antiquity, it has been already

^p Eccl. Pol., v. lv. 6.

pointed out that they are harder to reconcile with the Lutheran hypothesis than with the Roman. It is true, that the sacrament is bread and is Body, but that it therefore contains the two substances united, is a very shallow philosophy. The expression, "that is Pompey," might refer to the Roman general or to his statue; but no one would understand it of a *union* of the man and the marble together. In like manner, the words, "this is My Body," can only mean one of two things;—either, this is My Body under the form or appearance of bread;—or, this bread is My Body in mystical signification and power. A union of two original substances, Body and bread, cannot with any propriety of language be got out of the singular, "*this is*:" Bellarmine admits that if the pronoun *this* have bread for its subject, then it can be Body only in figure.

Neither do the Fathers ever speak of the sacrament as containing two subjects united. In their language, the bread *is* the Body, it is *made* the Body, it *becomes* the Body: but it is never *united* or joined to the Body. The ancient Liturgies invoke the Holy Ghost to make the bread the Body; but nowhere in antiquity shall we find the Lutheran petition, "*ut Deus elementa externa cum Corpore et Sanguine J. C. uniat*."¹

It may be added, that the conception, originated by Luther in the first pressure of the Roman controversy, contributes *nothing* to the solution of the mystery. That the Human Nature of our Lord in glory should be thus united to innumerable pieces of material bread, is quite as incredible as that it should

¹ Pfaff, de Cons., xxi.

take the place of their natural substance, and be present under their forms or accidents. And what is more, neither hypothesis in the least promotes the true purpose of the sacrament—communion with Christ in the heart by faith.

It has been observed that both Lutheran and Roman divines sometimes disclaim the word *corporal*, by which their doctrine of the Presence is commonly described. They repudiate a natural, material, organic, or local presence, asserting that the Body is present after the manner of a spirit, and this they choose to call a Spiritual Presence¹. But language is of use only to express the conceptions of the human mind, and in these *body* is distinguished from *spirit* as being material, organic, and local. To deny these qualities of the Body of Christ, is to deny the truth of His Humanity; to say that He is present without them, is to say, that He is present in Spirit with the *power*, operation, and efficacy of the Body, but *not* the substance. To assert the substantial presence of a body

¹ So Bellarmine: "Vere et realiter, non dicemus *corporaliter*, i.e. eo modo quo *sua natura* existunt corpora."—*De Euch.* i. 2. So the Form. Conc. vii.: "Dicimus Corpus et Sanguinem Christi in S.Cœna spiritualiter accipi, edi, et bibi. Tametsi enim participatio illa ore fiat: tamen modus spiritualis est." Just before a *corporalis præsentia* is denied, "quæ tamen ea ratione adstruitur ut Corpus Christi vere, licet spiritualiter, præsens esse credatur." This Body is declared to be one and the same with the Body of Christ in glory, and therefore His Divinity is also present. "Loquimur de præsentia Christi vivi."—*Apol. Aug. Confess. Art. iv.* (*Pfaff de Cons. Vet. Euch.*)

Yet Bellarmine writes in the same treatise: "Quod autem *corporaliter* et proprie sumatur Sanguis et Caro," &c. And this is the common language of both Churches.—*See Laud's Conference with Fisher*, s. 35.

without the qualities which make it body, is a mere contradiction in terms^a.

What the Fathers teach is, that Christ's Body is in heaven, and its presence upon earth is due to the hypostatic union with His omnipresent Godhead. In this "heavenly, spiritual, and immaterial way," the glorified Humanity of our exalted Lord is indeed peculiarly present, and partaken of by the faithful, in the Holy Eucharist. This is not the presence of a body contained in or united to another body, but a presence in spirit and effect of a Body *locally* absent. The elements remain in substance what they always were; what they acquire by consecration is the power of communicating to the faithful receiver the Body and Blood of Christ; and for this reason the Fathers called the bread the Body, and the wine the Blood, "in a mystery," and "by spiritual effect." The effect is union with Christ; He in us and we in Him, and so with the Father,—*"I in them and Thou in Me."*

^a It must be confessed that the older Lutheran doctrine of the God-Man gave too great preponderance to the Divine, as is evident from the fact that it ascribed to Jesus, even during His earthly life, and with regard to the human side of his Person—omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience; though the possession of these attributes does not agree with the picture presented by the Gospel history.—*Luthardt Lectures on Saving Truths of Christianity*, Lect. iv., note, Eng. Trans., p. 366.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ANGLICAN DOCTRINE.

THE English Reformation differed widely from the continental, both in conception and execution. On the Continent the new wine burst the old bottles, and had to be gathered by individual reformers into new vessels. In England, the Church was enabled to reform herself on her own basis, without disruption, or breach of continuity.

The Church of England was always distinctly national. The State was in some sense her offspring. Its parliamentary representation was formed upon the model of her Synods. Her Prelates had a large share in the government of the State; they were not afraid of the censures of Rome^a. The incorporation of Convocation with Parliament supplied a National Council, able and eager to repel interference from without. The civil tribunals disowned the Pope's authority; the Legislature set bounds to his ecclesiastical prerogative^b. Down to the fifteenth century, Cardinals and Legates were unwelcome visitors.

After the defeat of the Councils, Pope Martin V., in the new character of supreme ordinary, succeeded in

^a Walter Gray, Archbishop of York, died excommunicated by the Pope, A.D. 1255, but was nevertheless buried with honour in the south transept of our minster, erected by himself, "the choicest portion of that glorious temple."—Raine's *Fasti Eboracensis*, p. 293.

^b Statutes of Premunire and Provisors, 27 Ed. III., c. 1; 16 Rich. II., c. 5.

planting a resident Legate as his representative in England^c. This usurpation of jurisdiction was effected under the feeble government of Henry VI., in the teeth of the law, and largely contributed to the fall of the Lancastrian dynasty. A century later it suffered in the person of Wolsey the penalties of a Pre-munire, although exercised with the Royal Assent, and the sentence was followed by the repudiation of the Papacy altogether.

^c The particulars may be agreeably read in Dr. Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops," a work of prodigious research, and the most lively interest. Stephen Langton was a Roman Cardinal before his intrusion on the English primacy; but Cardinals were not then foreign princes, and Langton proved a better Englishman than the king. At a later period, the acceptance of the red hat by an English subject was deemed an act of disloyalty, and vacated all ecclesiastical preferment. Kilwardby was obliged to resign the see of Canterbury, and leave the kingdom, in 1278. When Archbishop Langham was made a Cardinal in 1368, the king seized the temporalities, and was hardly persuaded to let him repair to his foreign master at Avignon. In the infancy of Henry VI., Cardinal Beaufort, the king's uncle, was permitted to retain the wealthy see of Winchester, and reside in England as permanent Legate *a latere*, to represent the Pope, and control the metropolitans (A.D. 1428). The proposal had been sternly rejected by Henry V., and was still resisted by the Archbishop of Canterbury as an innovation against the law of Church and State. The king's proctor insisted on the necessity of the royal licence, which was only granted on the Legate taking an oath to do nothing against the Royal Prerogative.—(*Collier, Ecclesiastical History*, Part I. Book vii.) In 1409, Chichele was consecrated Bishop of St. David's at Rome by Pope Gregory XII., who granted him a bull to retain his former preferments *in commendam*. But the king, though assenting to the promotion, contested this bull, and obtained judgment against it in the Court of King's Bench. The grant was in the name of the Apostle Peter, and was supported by the maxim of the canon law, *Papa omnia potest*. The Chief Justice declined to entertain the question of the Apostle's authority in the abstract, but was clear that he had no power to change the law of England.—(*Hook*, v. 23.)

It was not a question of religion, but of national independence: that the Bishop of Rome had no jurisdiction in the realm of England, was determined by the Convocations of both Provinces, before any change of doctrine or discipline was attempted^d. The King himself lived and died in the faith, though not in the obedience, of Rome. The Ceremonies, Service, and Discipline of the Church, with all internal ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were expressly reserved^e. The papal authority was repudiated as outside the organization of the National Church^f, and on principles inherent in the constitution of the realm.

It was affirmed—

“that this Realm of England is an Empire governed by one supreme Head and King, having the dignity and royal estate of the Imperial Crown of the same, unto whom the body politic divided in terms and by names of spirituality and

^d A.D. 1531. The Act of Supremacy, (24 Hen. VIII. c. 12,) passed the next year, and the Act against Appeals (25 Hen. VIII. c. 19) a year later. It may be observed that the title granted to the king was “*ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani quantum per Christi legem licet supremum caput*,” the clergy were then “usually called the English Church,” and the meaning was to exclude their resort to the Pope in any capacity. In his Letter to the Convocation of York, the king himself said, “It were *nimis absurdum* for us to be called *Caput Ecclesiæ repræstans Corpus Christi mysticum*.” The title was repealed by statute of the 1st Queen Mary, and has never been revived.

^e 28 Hen. VIII. c. 10.

^f Between rival popes every kingdom determined its own obedience. In the great schism, England and Germany acknowledged Urban VI.; and France, with Scotland and Austria, Clement VII. When the pretenders multiplied, it was enacted in the parliament of 1415, “that all bishops elect and other persons should be confirmed by their own metropolitans, upon the king’s writ, without further excuse or delay.”—(Hook, v. 47.)

temporality been bounden and owen to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience." And further, that "when any cause of the Law Divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, that it was declared, interpreted, and shewed by that part of the said body politick called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath always been thought, and is also at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties, as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain^e."

The English Reformation was the work of the National Church, in the independent capacity here asserted. It was not a new Church, but the old one released from foreign bondage^h.

When internal reforms were found requisite, they were effected by revising existing formularies, more than by composing new ones. We had no Luthers or Calvins to compile systems of doctrine and worship, and collect adherents on private judgment. Our divines could only submit their amendments to the constituted authorities. More than a century elapsed between the first English Liturgy, and the form now established by law; and two complete revolutions, one papal, the other ultra-Protestant, were effected in the interval. The fluctuations of opinion were

^e 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12. Preamble.

^h The phrase, "Our mother the Church of England," is common in pre-Reformation writings. English Catholics did not conceive themselves to be "members of the Church of Rome," when they acknowledged the primacy of the Roman See.

great, but the Church survives them all, and must be interpreted by her own decrees. If the royal prerogative was pushed at times to excess, the foreign tyranny was greater and more unscrupulous. The popes resorted to foreign invasion and domestic conspiracy. The Crown had no standing army, and was strong only in embodying the mind of the nation.

The consent of the Church and the State was the basis and ratification of the whole Reformation. The first and greatest step was to recognise the Canon of Scripture and the three Creeds as the rule of faith, and the decrees of the Four General Councils as the sole *criteria* of heresyⁱ. This and no more (beyond a retrenchment of holy days, and some diminution of ceremonial) was effected under Henry VIII.

The opening of the next reign was signalised by the restoration of Communion in both kinds, and the prohibition of Elevation,—changes implying repudiation of the Corporal Presence^k. The Eucharistic Sacrifice was discussed in Convocation at the same time, when Cranmer re-asserted the definition of Peter Lombard, that the oblation was not the “very true sacrifice of Christ (for that was done but once

ⁱ Articles subscribed in the Two Convocations, and promulgated by the king, A.D. 1536, (Collier, Eccl. Hist. part ii. book iii.); the *Sarum Portiforium* was re-issued in 1541, with the omission of all reference to the Pope, the offices of Becket, and some other questionable saints. About the same time appeared the *Rationale* of Ceremonies, in which Transubstantiation and the adoration of the Host are affirmed. Some of these ceremonies were abolished by the king's letters to the archbishop in 1545, (Ibid., book iii.).

^k Order of the Communion, 1548; established by the Act, 1 Edw. VI. c. 1.

by Himself on the cross) but the memory and representation of it. Ridley, Holbeck, and Ferrars, Bishops of London, Rochester, and St. David's, were to the same effect. Some thought the oblation nothing more than prayer and thanksgiving, with the remembrance of the Saviour's death. The Archbishop of York and ten other bishops held it to be "the presenting the very Body and Blood of Christ to the Father, under the forms of bread and wine." Only one, the Bishop of Carlisle, affirmed it to be the same sacrifice that was offered by Christ on the cross; denying, however, that any act of the priests could satisfy for sin, venial or mortal, since the Passion itself was the one perfect and plenary satisfaction. Still he held the Mass might benefit departed souls burdened only with lesser faults¹.

Cranmer further declared the reservation of the sacrament to be a practice no earlier than the sixth or seventh century, and the hanging it up over the altar much later. The Bishop of Lincoln added, that the last was not even yet universally established.

In the first English Liturgy enacted the year after, the Canon of the Mass was replaced by a new prayer, more akin to the Greek offices. After reciting the words of Institution, the priest proceeded to "celebrate and make with the holy gifts the memorial which Christ willed us to make." This was followed by the self-oblation of soul and body, as in the present Liturgy. The office retained the name, and some of the vestments, of the Mass. It was said (as before) at the altar, also called God's Board, and the Lord's

¹ Collier, *Eccel. Hist.*, part ii. book iv. p. 243.

Table, and the unleavened bread and mixed chalice of ancient use were still continued.

These particulars were altered in the Second Book of 1552, but it is expressly declared in the Act which established this Book, that no change of doctrine was involved. The chief changes were the omission of the names Mass and Altar, the discarding the Mass Vestments, and the substitution of wooden Tables for the decorated structures of the mediæval period. The object was to wean the people from the Sacrifice of the Mass; but there was no intention of repudiating the primitive Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Royal Letter which directed them expressly states that the name and form of Altar or Table are indifferent, "for that there is offered the same sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"^m?

The Rituals will be considered in their proper placeⁿ. All that is here to be noted is that they are set forth as the complete standard of the Anglican doctrine of the Sacraments^o. The Articles of Religion prescribed to the Clergy were to correct particular errors, more than to re-affirm the undisputed deposit preserved in the Liturgy. They insist on the proper uses of the Sacraments, as ordained by Christ, and on their operation by faith, and not *ex opere operato*^p. They reject Transubstantiation, with the reservation, elevation, and adoration of the Host^q. The Sacrifices of Masses, in

^m King's Letter to Bp. Ridley, A.D. 1550. Foxe, E. H., ii. 1519.

ⁿ *Infra*, Chapter xii.

^o Canon 57, 1603-4.

^p Art. XXVI.

^q Art. XXIX. The Latin version of the concluding sentence is, "Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, cir-

the which the priest is said to offer Christ for the quick and the dead, are condemned as pernicious impostures, and the offering of Christ made once for ever is declared the only satisfaction for sins original and actual. Finally, the corporal Presence is denied under any explanation, forasmuch as the Body of Christ is in heaven and not here^a.

cumferebatur, elevebatur nec adorabatur." The natural construction of these words, taken in connection with a similar phrase in Art. XXVI., is to exclude the things specified as *contrary* to the Institution of Christ; not (as has been lately argued) only to affirm that they were not ordained by Christ, but by the Church, and therefore lawful, though not essential.

^a Art. XXXI. The plural "sacrificia missarum" has been contrasted with the Tridentine "sacrificium missæ," as though the subject-matter were not the same. It is pretended that our Article is levelled at certain popular misconceptions prevailing before the Council of Trent, and really corrected by its decrees. An all-sufficient answer to this hypothesis is, that the Articles subscribed in 1552 by way of reply to the original Council (A.D. 1546—1552), were revised and promulgated anew after the re-assembly of the Council in 1562. The Decree of the Eucharist was promulgated by the earlier assembly (11 October, 1551), that on the Sacrifice of the Mass at the second meeting (17 Sept., 1562). The XXXIX. Articles of Elizabeth's reign were subscribed in Convocation, 29 Jan., 1562, O.S., that is, four months *later*; and the words of the Article, "Sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem peccatæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis," are plainly aimed at the last paragraph in the Decree, "Quare non solum pro fidelium *vivorum* peccatis, *pænis*, *satisfactionibus* et aliis necessitatibus sed *pro defunctis* in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis rite juxta Apostolorum traditionem *offertur*."—(Trid. Con., Sess. xxii. cap. 2.) The only change made in the Article after reading this decree, was to substitute the word "blasphemous" for "forged." The plural number was doubtless meant to deny the fictitious identity of the Mass and the cross. The Eucharist is in truth a fresh sacrifice every time it is celebrated, though being, as St. Chrysostom says, the remembrance of the one sacrifice; it is, *in that sense*, always the same.

^a Art. XXIX., A.D. 1552, omitted in 1562, but embodied, with some corrections, in the "Black Rubric," 1662. The Article denies the "real and bodily Presence, as they term it, of Christ's Flesh and Blood

The Articles are silent on the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as distinguished from the Sacrifice of the Mass. They neither endorse the denials of Luther and Calvin, nor undertake a new definition of a point then profoundly obscured by controversy. The question of sacrifice or communion was a false issue, raised by the long divorce of two properly inseparable properties. So long as that issue stood alone before the world, and the whole authority of Rome was thrown into one scale, the Church of England cast her weight into the other. A valid communion implies the sacrifice under any form of celebration, whereas oblation without communion is no Christian sacrifice at all.

The Articles assert: (1.) The Communion of all present in both kinds, as an indispensable part of the rite; (2.) The commemoration and pleading before God of the Sacrifice of the Cross as the sole satisfaction for sin; (3.) The Spiritual Presence against the Corporal, excluding reservation, adoration, and all other purposes *extra usum sacramenti*; (4.) The limitation of the special grace of the celebration to those who receive the Sacrament; without prejudice to the power of prayer for the whole mystical body, whether militant or at rest. These are the first and main lines of the English Reformation. The nature

in the sacrament." The Rubric more correctly reads, "any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." On the other hand, the Article is more correct, that *Christ* is in heaven, than the Rubric which says, "the natural Body and *Blood* of our Saviour Christ are in heaven," an expression borrowed from the doctrine condemned. In Scripture, antiquity, and every other part of our Prayer-book, the "Body and Blood" mean the *crucified* Body.

of the Presence and the sacrifice were no further determined than by the general appeal to Catholic antiquity. All was highly characteristic of the conservative and practical tone of the English mind. If the National Church was to be retained in its integrity, a large allowance in subordinate matters was indispensable. A full and true celebration of the Eucharist will always secure the entire benefits which belong to the rite, whereas a maimed and defective ministration might endanger all. A true Presence and a true sacrifice was always believed in; it was not necessary to define them too minutely, after rejecting the inadmissible corruptions. A Church which claims to inherit the Catholic deposit, and expects the obedience of a nation, does not draw up articles of agreement like a private society. It is enough to condemn what is judged inconsistent with the Faith. The rest remains as before, on the sure foundations of Scripture and Catholic antiquity. Jewel's "Apology," a work of almost synodical authority, is one continuous appeal to Scripture, Councils, and Fathers. It complains of the charge of departing from the Catholic Church as an odious calumny.

"The Holy Gospel of God, the ancient Bishops, and the Primitive Church are on our side, and it is not without just cause that we have receded from them (Romanists), and returned to the Apostles and the old Catholic Fathers; and this we do, not vaguely or craftily, but in good faith and before God, truly, ingenuously, clearly, and perspicuously. . . . We receive and embrace all the Canonical Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. We receive the Sacraments of the Church, and with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose,

Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic Fathers, we term them figures, signs, symbols, types, anti-types, examples, images, remembrances, memories. We receive also and venerate not only what we know to have been delivered by the Apostles, but also whatever seems to us may be retained without injury to the Church. . . . For we use the primitive and ancient laws, and so far as can be done in these times and manners amid the universal corruption, we diligently and seriously exercise the ecclesiastical discipline¹."

To the same purport is the Canon of 1603:—

"The abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practice, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which doth neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches which were their first founders²."

Our Reformation being thus always aimed at restoring the faith and worship of the primitive Church, the sacrificial character of the Eucharist gradually rose to the surface, as soon as the more urgent matter of communion had been secured. In the Anglican view the Eucharistic Sacrifice is a commemorative and representative rite, and therefore *not* the same with the

¹ Apolog. Ecc. Aug.

² Canon 30.

Sacrifice of the cross, either in the whole action or the visible oblation. On the cross Jesus Christ offered Himself a Sacrifice for the sins of the world;—in the Eucharist the Church offers a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, to commemorate and plead before God that atoning Sacrifice, and to apply its benefits to the faithful communicant. On the cross the great High Priest offered His Human Nature as the one Sacrifice for all human sin;—in the Eucharist, an oblation of bread and wine, the appointed symbols of that crucified Body and Blood, is presented on the altar, “to shew the Lord’s Death till He come.” They are then received from the Holy Table, consecrated into the Real Communion of that which they represent. This sacrifice and peace-offering, which Christ left to His Church in remembrance of Him, is propitiatory in the sense of pleading, and applying to the worthy communicant, the propitiation once made for all on the cross. But it is not a sin-offering or satisfaction for sin, not propitiatory in the sense of meriting or working remission *per se*, either for communicants or any others.

The true objects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice are—

1. To praise God for the mercies of Creation, Providence, and Redemption.
2. To plead and commemorate the Sacrifice of the cross, communicating the Body and Blood, there offered, to the faithful receiver.
3. To offer ourselves, in union with Christ, a living sacrifice unto God.

It follows that none who do not communicate, or who communicate unworthily, either assist in the sacri-

fice, or partake of the Lord's Body and Blood ; since these are not substantially contained in, or united to, the elements, but exhibited in mystery, and realized in faithful reception. For the same reason, though "no one eats without adoring Christ," our adoration is not offered to anything in the paten or the chalice, but to the glorified Body, which "is in Heaven and not here."

The phrase "Real Presence," though not found in the Anglican formularies,—perhaps on account of the ambiguity introduced into it by the Church of Rome^x, —is received by our divines in its true and original meaning ; viz. that Christ is really present to the faithful communicant in the eating and drinking of the consecrated gifts, and that not by the internal action of his own mind, or faith alone, (which some call a *subjective* presence,) but by a real Presence, from without, of the Person of the God-man. In this sense the Real Presence is held not only by the Anglican Church, but, as Bishop Cosin shews, by all Protestant confessions, as firmly as by the Church of Rome or the Lutherans. The peculiarity of the two latter is the seating Christ's *Person* in the material elements, apart from communion, and even when there is no communion save of the priest^y. This the Church of

^y St. Augustine's "nemo manducat nisi prius adoraverit illam carnem," has reference to the acknowledgment of our Lord's Divinity, not to any particular act of adoration. The Romish interpolation of *id* is exposed in Dr. Pusey's "Letter to the Bishop of London," p. 76.

^x Dr. Vogan maintains that the phrase is scarcely earlier than the Reformation period ; but it seems necessarily implied in all ancient teaching, and was naturally affirmed, when spiritual presence was called imaginary.

^y Eccl. Pol., v. lxvii. 12.

England, in common with all other Protestants, steadfastly denies.

On the controversy so raised it is important to remark at the outset, that Scripture and antiquity are wholly ignorant of it. The Eucharist is never mentioned in Scripture, or any Catholic Liturgy, but with a view to communion; *all* that is said of it by apostles or fathers is said in relation to a rite culminating in oral participation. Consequently nothing in their testimony can apply to consecrated elements which are not eaten, or to a worshipper who does not communicate.

In the next place, it is a mistake to suppose that the communicant receives only what he orally eats and drinks. Even the Romanist allows that Christ must dwell in the heart by faith; but He is no nearer to the heart or soul in the hand of the priest, than at the right hand of the Father. He does not enter the soul by corporal contact, but by spiritual union; and to this nothing is gained by diminishing the local distance between His Body and ours: so that all have recourse to the Spiritual Presence in the end.

Thirdly, it is obvious that the Sacrament represents and communicates the *slain* Body and Blood, sundered in two elements, which therefore cannot be at the same moment the living Body of the Resurrection: nor are they ever called so in Holy Scripture. It is true, that in partaking of Christ's Death we are quickened with His life. He Himself is not absent from the sacrament of His death; but His Presence is the privilege of the faithful receiver, not of inanimate bread and wine. Our Lord's own words are, "He that eateth

My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, (he only) dwelleth in Me and I in him." The Flesh in the bread, the outshed Blood in the cup,—each really though in a mystery,—each with its distinct virtue and operation,—and then, as the *effect* of eating and drinking these, Christ the God-Man personally and spiritually dwelling in *us* and we in Him. Thus Hilary says the eating and drinking effect that we dwell in Christ and He in *us*².

Our Reformers could hardly be expected to emerge all at once from the ambiguity occasioned by the practice of calling both the slain and the living Body by the name of 'Christ.' It is a common usage, however, which seldom deceives when the nature of the object is regarded. When Augustus was offered his rival's head, with the words, "this is Pompey," no one mistook the meaning. So the Body and Blood, separated in two elements, plainly relate to a state of death: and the ancient Church was so far from referring them to the glorified Body, that it was, as we have seen, a question whether our Lord's Body in heaven has any *blood* in it at all. Certainly the apostle's expression, "by His own blood^a," refers not to living blood now in His veins, but to the sacrificial blood-shedding of the cross; and this is beyond question the mystery of the cup. The favourite maxim, *ubi Corpus ibi Christus*, would be a mere truism if *Corpus* denoted

² "De veritate carnis et sanguis non relictus est ambigendi locus; nunc et enim ipsius Domini professione et fide nostra vere caro est et vere sanguis est; et hæc accepta atque hausta id *efficiunt* ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit."—*Hilar. de Trinitate*, viii. (A.D. 354).

^a Heb. ix. 12.

the living Body, since that is of course Himself. The meaning is, that Christ is present (spiritually) where His dead Body is sacramentally exhibited and received. The sacrament exhibits the dead Body, not in substance, for it is no longer dead in fact, but mystically to faith, that the communicant may partake, through the Spirit, of the living Body united evermore to the Godhead in heaven. There is no hypostatic union with the sacrament.

This distinction is recognised by the best Anglican divines, following the language of antiquity, and in our Liturgy and Catechism. The corporal tenet, whether Romanist or Lutheran, reduces the Presence to the limits of the material elements, confounding the *sacramentum* with the *res sacramenti*. The force of the Anglican, as of patristic, theology will be found to lie in discriminating between the four objects involved in the rite. All agree in the Real Presence (1) of the Divine Person of God the Word; (2) of His true Humanity, Body and Soul now glorified in heaven; (3) of His Body broken and Blood shed upon the cross; (4) of the Eucharistic bread and wine. But instead of shutting all up in the paten and the chalice, the Anglican divines hold that each is present in its proper manner;—the first by the Omnipresence of God ever working with His gifts, but not comprehended or contained in them;—the second by the hypostatic union of God and Man in Christ, a “presence (as Hooker phrases it) of true conjunction with Deity;”—the third by mystical power, “a presence of force and efficacy throughout all generations of men;”—and the fourth by the natural presence of

the material elements in form and substance unchanged.

Each of these is a *real* Presence, in no degree the product of imagination or faith, but the genuine presence of an outward object, and the only presence (it may be reverently affirmed) which that object is capable of exhibiting to man. The province of faith lies in discerning and receiving each in the due sacramental order. First is the eating and drinking of the consecrated bread and wine, without which there is neither sacrament nor sacrifice, but a profane empty pageant. In so eating and drinking, the communicant partakes by faith of the sacrifice of the cross; he mystically eats the Flesh, and drinks the Blood, which Christ gave for the life of the world; and with this, the sacramental act is complete. But in so partaking of the Body of the sacrifice, we receive the further gift of incorporation in the Body of the Resurrection. This is spiritually to eat Christ Himself. That glorified Humanity, which is bodily at the right hand of the Father, is the Instrument—the *ὄργανον*—of all spiritual life to man,—the true Bread of God which cometh down from heaven,—the life-giving Flesh,—the germ of our resurrection, and the food of immortality. When cleansed by the sacrificed Body and Blood of the cross, the believer is incorporated with this new Head of Humanity on high, and so nourished to eternal life. “We dwell in Christ, and Christ in us: we are one with Christ, and Christ with us^b.” Hence, we are one with God the Word, and in Him with the Eternal Father.

^b Exhortation in Communion Office.

Meantime, the glorified Body of Jesus Christ "is in heaven and not here." Its presence in the Eucharist is a presence of conjunction with the Omnipresent Deity. What is *here* is, first the *personal* Presence of the Son of God, drawing with it the life-giving fellowship of His Humanity in heaven; and secondly, the *mystical* Presence of His sacrificed Body and Blood in the consecrated elements. The first is recognised by all Churches and Confessions as the main object of Eucharistic worship and participation: all acknowledge this Real Presence of the God-man; all too distinguish the spiritual act, which admits Him to the tabernacle of the heart, from the external reception of the sacrament. The Council of Trent itself confesses that the unworthy communicant receives sacramentally only, the worthy both sacramentally and spiritually, and even the believer who desires the sacrament, without the opportunity of obtaining it, receives spiritually though not sacramentally. In this highest view of the Presence, then, all agree with Hooker that it is to be sought not in the sacrament, but in the faithful receiver of the sacrament.

The controversy thickens round the mystical Presence of the "Body and Blood" in the consecrated elements;—the point which the Romish tenet had overlaid, and which was least investigated by the first Protestant disputants. Still, if we hold fast by the words of Institution, — the Body *broken* and the Blood *shed*,—it is certain that these are present only in force and efficacy, since Christ is no longer dead in fact. The sacrifice was finished on the cross, and the state of death passed away at the Resurrection,

but the force and efficacy of that death remain with God and man for ever. Now, a thing is as really present in the place where it *operates*, as in the place where it simply *exists* in form and substance. Nay, the power is often the only certain presence; i.e. it is sure and cognizable when the substance it proceeds from is unknown and absent. Such a presence our Lord assigns to the Spirit, as "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth." And to the question *how* His Flesh can be given us to eat, He expressly says, "The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life."

The Body and Blood of the cross, then, are now nowhere present, save in spirit, power, and efficacy; these our Lord so truly confers on the Eucharistic symbols, that the Body is not another thing united to the bread, or substituted under its form, but the bread is *itself* the Body, and the wine the Blood, as His own words expressly affirm. The "divine thing" in the sacrament is neither a Divine Person nor a Divine substance, but a Divine *gift* (or *quality*, so to speak) imparted to the bread and wine, whereby they are made the communion of the Body and Blood of the cross, and through these of the glorified Body in heaven. This is no rationalizing interpretation, like Transubstantiation and the co-existent theory, invented to sustain the pre-supposed error of a corporal presence. It is the closest and most literal following of the words, "This is My Body broken, this is My Blood shed." Moreover, it is the only reading, we con-

tend, which harmonizes the *entire* Eucharistic doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church^c.

The Protestant Reformation had an easy triumph in re-asserting the Spiritual Presence "in the heart," which the corporal error had obscured but not denied. It was equally unanimous in rejecting Transubstantiation, but it never succeeded in restoring the primitive agreement on the *mystical* presence in the elements.

While Luther held to the corporal error, the so-called Sacramentaries, rushing to the opposite extreme, denied any spiritual change or gift in the elements at all. They reasoned that no divine act on the material symbols was required, to make them the Lord's Body and Blood to the receiver, since that was effected by his own faith; and, further, that bread and wine were not fit subjects for the operation of the Holy Ghost. This rationalistic argument reduced consecration to a form, and made a present to the Church of Rome of all the ancient Liturgies and Fathers. For while it is true that these habitually call the sign by the name of the thing signified, yet this custom could never have become so fixed and universal, but for the belief that the sacrament is not only a figure, but "much more, hath the lively force of the true Body joined thereto, and so comprehendeth both^d."

The notion of "bare signs" is earnestly repudiated in our Articles and Homilies. The liturgical witness

^c This truly literal reading of the English as compared with the Roman and Lutheran interpretations, is well exhibited by Dr. Vogan.

^d See Bishop Ponet, *infra*.

against it is *consecration*, on which no episcopal Church ever wavered. If the faith of the receiver alone invests the element with sacramental grace, consecration must be either nugatory or misleading. But consecration meets us from the first. Our Lord Himself not only gave thanks to God over the bread and wine, but He distinctly blessed *them*, before delivering them to His disciples as His Body and Blood. The same condition precedent is repeated by the apostle, "The cup of blessing *which we bless*, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ?" *Symbols* the elements are before consecration; after it they are *sacraments*—i.e. symbols with a power and efficacy annexed, which makes them, to the faithful receiver, verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ. To deny this is to part at once with Scripture and antiquity. Our Lord's blessing of the bread and wine is solemnly recited in all the Liturgies; all invoke the Holy Ghost to come down upon the elements, and make them His Body and Blood. The Fathers are unanimous in calling them so, as the effect of that prayer. At the same time, the consecration being solely in order to communion, it implied no Presence for other purposes, if any other had been imagined.

To the rationalistic argument, that the Holy Ghost disdains to act upon senseless matter, it is answer enough that our Lord and His apostle blessed the bread and the cup. We read that the Spirit moved on the face of the waters to create the world, and the Spirit was breathed into the lifeless clay to make the first man a living soul. Further, the very Flesh of the Second Man was "conceived by the Holy Ghost."

God the Spirit prepared the tabernacle for God the Word to dwell in. And when "there went virtue out of Him" to the bodies and souls of men, it commonly passed by some material medium. Such was the "hem of His garment;" such was the clay applied to sightless eyes, useless, it is true, without faith, yet not void of a Divine gift, since without it the miracle was not wrought. Such, too, were the handkerchiefs and aprons from the apostle's body^e;"—not mechanically saturated with healing for whoever might intercept them, yet still *channels*, no less than pledges, of grace to the right receiver.

Just so the ancient Liturgies invoked the Holy Ghost on the Eucharistic gifts, believing, with Cyril of Jerusalem, that "what the Holy Ghost touches is thereby sanctified." They did not ask the glorified Manhood, or the Divine Person, of Christ to descend upon the elements, but the Holy Ghost, "the Spirit which quickeneth." Neither was the Spirit expected to unite Himself, or Christ, *hypostatically* to the bread and wine, but to endue them with the power and efficacy of the crucified Flesh to the communicants.

No less is taught by our own Church in defining Sacraments to be "not only badges and tokens, but rather certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, *by the which* He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him^f." There would have been little need to restrain the name of *sacraments* so jealously to the two Institutions of Christ, if she had not understood

^e Acts xix. 12.

^f Article XXV.

the word to imply a spiritual virtue conferred on the elements. Visible signs and inward grace are common to Confirmation and Holy Orders; the difference is, that in these latter the sign, not being ordained of Christ as generally necessary to salvation, cannot with equal confidence be alleged as that *by which* God works invisibly in us. The sign and the grace are present together, but the connexion between them is not declared "certain," as in Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

With the same feeling our Church declares Water and the Name of the Holy Trinity to be the "essential parts of Baptism:" a doctrine expressed also in the petition, "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin." Now no one will suppose the sanctification of the sacramental bread to be less real than that of the sacramental water: on the contrary, consecration is not deemed so indispensable in Baptism as in the Eucharist. The Fathers regard these two sacraments as each communicating Christ for its own purpose: neither contains Him in substance, but each is endowed with a special gift, whereby His spiritual Presence is both pledged and conveyed to the fit receiver.

The *reality* of this gift does not depend on the faith of the receiver, any more than on the worthiness of the minister, but on the commission and authority of Christ^s. It is not less really there because the unworthy communicant receives it not, any more than the sun is not in the sky because a blind man cannot see it. Indeed, the judgment pronounced on those who "discern not the Lord's Body" implies its pre-

^s Article XXVI.

sence, though it is a mystical and spiritual Presence, not corporal.

Clear, however, as the distinction seems between a Divine Person and a Divine gift, it is to be regretted that many Protestants, and some in our own Church, are as unable to receive it as the Romanists themselves. The Romanist will have the living Person of Christ to be veiled under the forms of bread and wine,—in the face of His own prayer, that the bread and wine themselves may be made, to those who receive them, His crucified Body and Blood. With no less inconsistency, the ultra-Protestant can see nothing but an empty figure in that which Christ consecrated to the Real participation of His Body and Blood. Between these extremes the Church of England keeps the middle path of primitive truth. For Christ, she bids her children prepare the tabernacle which He loves, in the heart. To His one sacrifice on the cross she refers all our propitiation. Yet with deepest reverence would she handle, and on her knees receive, the Holy Gifts, which are to us the Body and Blood of that all-reconciling sacrifice. For these are not symbols only, but symbols which the Holy Ghost has touched, and made to the faithful receiver verily and indeed what they represent.

The foregoing is submitted as a fair *conspectus* of the Anglican doctrine as delivered in the Church formularies, and attested by our most eminent divines. Of course, all have not expressed it in the same words, nor in equal fulness or distinctness. They wrote, as the Fathers wrote, for the special questions of their day, and we are still obliged to do the same. Like

ourselves, too, they were more or less biassed by private judgment. What we seek for are the points of agreement, not of difference; they will be found in the acknowledgment of a commemorative representative sacrifice, and of a true sacramental Presence, to the exclusion of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, and the corporal tenet, whether under the form of Transubstantiation and Concomitance, or the two co-existent substances of Martin Luther. All the rest follows naturally from these leading principles.

We commence with the Anglican teaching before the rise of Transubstantiation, of which an authentic specimen is extant in the writings of Elfric the Grammarian^b. The following is from his Easter Homily:—

“ Now certain men have often inquired, and yet frequently inquire, how the bread, which is prepared from corn, and baked by the heat of fire, can be changed to Christ's Body; or the wine, which is wrung from many berries, can by any blessing be changed to the Lord's Blood? Now we say to such men, that some things are said of Christ typically, some literally. It is a true and certain thing that Christ was born of a maiden, and of His own will suffered death, and was buried, and on this day arose from death. He is called bread typically, and lamb, and lion, and whatever

^b There were at least two Elfrics; one was Archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 995—1006), and the other Archbishop of York (A.D. 1023—1050). The Grammarian is identified with the latter by Wharton (*Angl. Sacra*, i. 125), but is now generally thought to be the same with the southern Primate (Hook's “Lives of the Archbishops,” i. 43). He was a monk of Abingdon. The northern Elfric, surnamed Puttock the *kite* (perhaps from the cruelties ascribed to him at Worcester), was a monk of Peterborough, and was interred in that house, (Raine's “Lives of the Archbishops of York,” 134.)

else. He is called bread, because He is the life of us and of angels ; He is called a lamb for His innocence ; a lion for the strength wherewith He overcame the strong devil. But yet, according to true nature, Christ is neither bread, nor a lamb, nor a lion. Why then is the holy housel called Christ's Body or His Blood, if it is not truly that which it is called? But the bread and the wine, which are hallowed through the mass of the priests, appear one thing to human understandings without, and cry another thing to believing minds within. Without they appear bread and wine, both in aspect and in taste ; but they are truly, after the hallowing, Christ's Body and His Blood, through a ghostly mystery. . . .

“ In like manner the holy font water, which is called the well-spring of life, is in appearance like other waters, and is subject to corruption ; but the might of the Holy Ghost approaches the corruptible water, through the blessing of the priests, and it can afterwards wash body and soul from all sins through ghostly might. Lo now we see two things in this one creature. According to true nature the water is a corruptible fluid, and according to ghostly mystery has salutary power ; in like manner, if we behold the holy housel in a bodily sense, then we see it is a corrupt and changeable creature ; but if we distinguish the holy might therein, then understand we there is life in it, and that it gives immortality to those who partake of it with belief. Great is the difference between the invisible might of the holy housel and the visible appearance of its own nature. By nature it is corruptible bread and corruptible wine, and is by power of the divine word truly Christ's Body and His Blood : not however bodily, but spiritually. Great is the difference between the Body in which Christ suffered and tho Body which is hallowed for housel. The body verily in which Christ suffered was born of Mary's flesh, with blood

and bones, with skin and sinews, with human limbs, quickened by a rational soul. His ghostly Body, which we call housel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, limbless and soulless, and there is therefore nothing therein to be understood bodily, but all is to be understood spiritually. Whatsoever there is in the housel which gives us the substance of life, that is from its ghostly power and invisible efficacy; therefore is the holy housel called a mystery, because one thing is seen therein, and another thing understood. That which is there seen has a bodily appearance, and that which we understand therein has ghostly might. Verily Christ's Body, which suffered death, and from death arose, will henceforth never die, but is eternal and impassible. The housel is temporary not eternal, corruptible and is distributed piece-meal, chewed betwixt teeth and sent into the belly; but it is nevertheless by ghostly might all in every part; . . . it is in every man whole by the invisible might. This mystery is a pledge and a *symbol*; Christ's Body is *truth*. The pledge we hold mystically until we come to the truth, and then will this pledge be ended. But it is, as we said, Christ's Body and His Blood, not bodily but spiritually (*non corporaliter sed spiritualiter*¹.)

Collier adds a similar passage from one of Elfric's letters to the clergy:—

“The sacrifice of the Eucharist is not our Saviour's Body in which He suffered for us, nor His Blood which He shed upon our account. But it is made His Body and Blood in a spiritual way, as the manna was which fell from the sky, and the water which flowed from the rock in the wilderness.”

¹ Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*, part I. book iii. Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," i. 441: the latter is followed in the above extract as the more literal translation.

Elfric's Homilies enjoyed the highest repute in the English Church, which the Greek Primate, Theodore, had enriched with the language and traditions of primitive Christianity. A century earlier, the chief opponent of Paschasius Radbert's material transmutation was the Anglican John Scot^k, of whom Berengarius was a disciple. He maintained the Spiritual Presence, affirming that the consecrated elements were not physically changed, nor united to another substance, but retaining their own nature of bread and wine were themselves the Body and Blood ("panis atque vinum altaris post consecrationem *sunt* corpus Christi et sanguis¹."). This was the teaching of the English Church till it fell by the Norman Conquest. Lanfranc came over the pledged supporter of the corporal tenet; though no theologian, he had taken part at Rome in the condemnation of Berengarius, and the controversy was embittered by a rupture of the bonds of personal friendship. Still, the cup continued to be administered in England down to the end of the thirteenth century, and the adora-

^k Scotus Erigena, not to be confounded with the Franciscan Duns Scotus, the "subtle doctor" of the fourteenth century. Both were named John, both perhaps natives of Ireland, both were Greek scholars, and both taught in England,—Erigena at the court of Alfred the Great, and Duns in the University of Oxford. Erigena was a disciple of Bede, a companion of Alcuin, and one of the founders of the University of Paris: but some ultramontane writers assign these distinctions to another John, a Saxon, in order to lessen the repute of the heretic. He has also been supposed to be the Bertramn or Raframn who answered Radbert. (Bowers "Lives of the Popes," v. 173. Mosheim, Cent. ix. c. iii.)

¹ Milman's "Latin Christianity," book vi. c. ii.

tion of the host was at no time admitted into the ritual of the English Church^m.

Wiclif, like Luther, easily threw off the notion of Transubstantiation which, indeed, was by no means universally accepted in the Roman obedience. He defined the presence in the host to be virtual, spiritual, and sacramental, denying that it was either identical with the Body in heaven, or joined to it by hypostatic union. His explanation is entangled in the jargon of the schools, but on the whole seems to repudiate the corporal presenceⁿ.

Clearer views were attained, when the revival of Greek learning restored the language of the New Testament and the early Church.

The following is from a lecture delivered in the University of Oxford, forty years before the rupture with Rome, when Henry VIII. was an infant, and Luther and Cranmer were at school, bewailing the merciless rod of the pedagogue.

“The Lord’s Supper is bread broken, and His most holy Body distributed to His own; also together with the bread, the drinking of the Blood of the same whereby the compact and covenant of God with man has been ratified, for all things are consecrated and ratified by the Blood of the sacred victims. By the redeeming sanctifying Blood of the

^m Archdeacon Freeman’s “Principles of Divine Service,” perhaps the most learned work of the day, and the truest *eirenicon*, because a genuine appeal to Catholic antiquity.

ⁿ Confessio M. Johannis Wycllyff, Lewis’s Life, Coll. No. 21. A further consideration of this verbose explanation, with its interminable scholastic distinctions, inclines me to a more favourable opinion than was expressed in my First Edition.

Lamb that was slain, the spotless Christ, God's new covenant and Testament with the redeemed and sanctified is consecrated; which is that, if we serve God through Christ, and in Christ imitating Him, then by virtue of this agreement and compact, confirmed by the Blood of Christ, we shall be joint partakers also of the glory of Jesus Christ; otherwise the compact is void. In this Supper of the Lord, and the eating of the bread and drinking of the cup, is a commemoration, and shewing forth, and representation of the death of Christ. It is a kind (*siquidem*) of breaking of His Body, and as it were (*quasi*) effusion of His Blood. But the breaking and effusion is in order that the elect may feed on that victim (*hostia*); that Christ dying into them, they may live again in Him, (*ut Christus moriens in ipsis ii reviviscant in eo*); that having whole Jesus in themselves, they may be whole and entirely in Jesus; being now incorporate and concorporate with Him by the common participation of His unifying life-giving Body, who in His own supper imparts Himself to us whole, that He may transform us wholly into Himself, and make us members with Himself; that with Him the Head, His own may compose as it were one Body, all having God and all in God, not only by communication of Deity in our souls, but also by communication of His Body in our bodies, that we may coalesce into one body in Him. In this way He Himself (for such the Church is,) feeds on Himself, nor is the Church nourished by any other food than Christ; all are priests in Him, both sacrificing together and feasting together on the same victim; the Church herself (that is assuredly Christ Himself) being fed and nourished to eternal life by Christ's own self. Jesus Christ was offered, immolated, and put to death, that we may feed on the sacrifice till He come, and that feeding we may remember His dying for us; being par-

takers of His death that we may live in Him, partakers also of His life; that we being now dead in Him, we may from the dead be alive again in Him. We are here in the temple, that all may eat of the victim, and all be partakers of the altar of God; yea, of God Himself, immolated on the altar of the cross; that together with Him and in Him we, being crucified and immolated, may also be sacrifices acceptable to God. So, then, to sup together with the Lord is to die together with Him. He said to the sons of Zebedee, 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of?' He called His death also a cup when He prayed, 'Let this cup pass from Me.' So also Paul, 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils;' that is, ye cannot die in Christ and live with devils. He gave to His own the body, which for them was being delivered up; this He willed them to partake in common in remembrance of His death, and that worthily, lest they should be guilty of their Lord's death. If they eat unworthily they murder Christ, if they eat worthily they live in the dead, and dying together in Him, live also in Him. The worthiness is in the innocency, they must be innocent as Christ was innocent, that eating innocently they may represent the death of the most innocent Jesus. The wicked are guilty with Judas of the Body and Blood of the Lord; murdering Him they are not made alive in Him, not being so partakers of His death as to be made alive, and to discriminate and discern the Lord's Body. To the strong it is solid health-giving meat; it is death to the sick in sins of soul and body*."

This exposition was probably listened to by Erasmus, who was then at Oxford studying Greek. The author,

* Enarratio in 1 Corinth.; published 1874, with a translation and notes by the Rev. J. H. Lupton. I have ventured to correct the translation here and there, in more literal conformity to the original.

John Colet, became an eminent Court preacher and Dean of St. Paul's. He was the friend of Archbishop Warham, and preached the sermon when Wolsey received the red hat in Westminster Abbey. He was dead before Henry VIII. entered the lists against Martin Luther; yet nowhere shall we find a fuller exposition of the Reformed Anglican doctrine. The consecrated elements retain their proper nature; they represent the breaking of Christ's Body and the effusion of His Blood; the Eucharist is a sacrifice, we eat and drink with God at the altar, it is the communion of the sacrifice of the cross;—of Christ dead that we may also live with Him, thus it is a participation of God. It is also the sacrifice and participation of the Church as one Body with Christ, exactly as S. Augustine teaches, and our own Liturgy. Such views were by no means uncommon in the Roman obedience before the Council of Trent. Even Henry VIII. argued against Luther,—

“That the sacrifice of the Mass was a representation of the sacrifice of the cross. The priest offered to the Father by way of representation what was actually done by our Saviour on the cross, when He completed in that sacrifice what He had begun in the supper^p.”

It was no new doctrine then which *Cranmer* reasserted from Peter Lombard:—

“The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed

^p Collier, Eccl. Hist., part ii. bk. i.

by the priest and the people, (for that was done but once by Himself on the cross,) but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation, which before was made upon the cross¹."

In the *participation*, he maintained a true partaking of the Passion, and so of Christ Himself:—

"If you understand by this word 'really' *reipsa*, that is, in very deed and effectually, so Christ by the grace and efficacy of His Passion is indeed and truly present, &c. But if by this word 'really' you understand *corporaliter*, in His natural and organical Body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is contrary to the holy Word of God²."

Again:—

"The same visible and palpable Flesh that was for us crucified, &c., is eaten of Christian people at His holy Supper. . . . The diversity is not in the Body but in the eating thereof, no man eating it carnally, but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, *that is to say figuratively*."

This is the *sacramentaliter et spiritualiter* found in the Tridentine Decree.

In another place Cranmer explains the word "sacrament" to mean sometimes the *sacramentum* or outward sign, and sometimes the whole ministration and receiving of the sacraments. Hence, by Christ's Presence in the sacrament he means either His "sacramental Presence," i.e. His Body and Blood mystically

¹ Collier, Eccl. Hist., part ii. book iv.

² Laud's Conference with Fisher, s. xxxv. No. 6, p. 4.

³ Cranmer's Remains, iii. 310; Goode, 769.

represented in the *sacramentum*,—or the Real and true Presence of Himself “by power, virtue, and grace, in all them that worthily receive the same;” and this he maintains is the meaning of the old writers and holy doctors.

“My meaning is that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ’s Body that was crucified for us, and of His Blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacrament. But all this I understand of His spiritual Presence, of the which He saith, ‘I will be with you unto the world’s end, &c., and he that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him.’ . . We grant that our flesh eateth and drinketh the bread and wine which He called the Body and Blood of Christ, because as Tertullian saith they do represent His Body and Blood, although they be not really the same in very deed. . . To declare justly and plainly the very truth according to the mind of Chrysostom, as we see with our eyes and eat with our mouths very bread, and see also and drink very wine, so we lift up our hearts unto heaven, and with our faith we see Christ crucified with our spiritual eyes, and eat His Flesh thrust through with a spear, and drink His Blood springing out of His side, with our spiritual mouths of faith¹.”

Ridley testifies, in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine, that “all learned men in England grant there to be but *one substance*,” which is the sign or sacrament. The “matter of the sacrament” (or the thing signified) is received only by faith. Hence, he writes,—

“Evil men do eat the Body of Christ sacramentally, but

¹ Answer to Gardiner; Dean Goode, p. 771. Waterland, Review, c. vii.

² *Ibid.*, 767.

good men eat both the sacrament and the matter of the sacrament^v. . . .”

Again :—

“We confess all one thing to be in the sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I confess Christ’s natural Body to be in the sacrament by spirit and grace, &c.; you make a grosser kind of being, inclosing a natural body under the shape and form of bread and wine^w.”

Again :—

“The representation and commemoration of Christ’s Death and Passion said and done in the Mass is called the sacrifice, oblation, or immolation of Christ, *non rei veritate*, (as learned men do write,) *sed significante mysterio*.”

And again :—

“I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtle shifts: the one is by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice offered up once for all; the other is by depraving and wresting the sayings of the ancient fathers into such a strange kind of sense as the fathers themselves never indeed meant^x.”

To Ridley probably is due the introduction of a figure often repeated by English divines :—

“The substance of the natural Body and Blood of Christ is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the latter day;—but by grace the same Body of Christ is here present

^v Remains; Goode, p. 768. ^w Laud’s Conf., s. xxxv. No. 6, p. 4.

^x Works, Cambridge, 1841, p. 209-10.

with us; even as, for example, we say the same sun, which in substance never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here, by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's Word and His Sacraments be as it were the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of Righteousness¹."

In this passage Ridley falls into the then common practice of using the words "Body and Blood," to denote the Body in heaven. In another place he writes more distinctively:—

"The sacrament of the Blood is the Blood, and that is attributed to the sacrament which is spoken of the *res sacramenti*.—The Blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but not in the Real Presence, but by grace and in a sacrament."

In his reply to the three articles propounded to him at Oxford, Ridley complains of the ambiguity of the word *realiter*. He says in another place:—

"Which may be taken *transcendenter* and so signify whatever in any way belongs to the Body of Christ; in which sense we grant the Body of Christ to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper;"—or for "the living corporal thing itself, (*rem ipsam corpoream animatam*,) which has been taken into unity of person by the Word of God; according to which signification the Body of Christ, since it is really in heaven after the true mode of a body, cannot be said to be here in earth²."

That the glorified Body of Christ is contained in the sacrament he maintains to be a monstrous and

¹ Remains, p. 18; Goode, p. 766.

² Remains, p. 238; *ibid.*, 768.

absurd position, founded upon Transubstantiation. He grants its presence by virtue and grace, but denies it as to the whole essence and substance of the Body. Such an opinion he holds to be injurious to the truth of Christ's human nature, and contrary to the Fathers, the Scripture, and the Creed, which assert His Ascension into heaven only to come again at the last day.

Such a presence evacuates the institution of the sacrament as a *memorial*, "*commemoratio non est rei præsentis sed præteritæ et absentis*," (clearly referring to the *sacrificed* Body and Blood). It makes the real and corporal Body of our Lord, in which dwells the fullness of Spirit, Light, and Grace, to be received by wicked men, and even mice and dogs. It necessitates concomitancy and the denial of the cup.

Of the true Presence he concludes with the orthodox Fathers,—

"That not only a signification of the Lord's Body is made in the sacrament, but that *with it is exhibited* to the pious and faithful the grace of Christ's Body, that is to say, the life and food of immortality, (as Cyprian says). And so we eat and drink life, (with Augustine,) we perceive the Lord present in grace, (with Emissenus,) we receive the heavenly food that cometh down from above, (with Athanasius,) the nature and life-giving benediction of His Flesh in bread and wine, (with Cyril,) the virtue of Christ's Flesh, the life and grace which are the property of the only begotten Body, that is, as Cyril himself explains—*Life*. We confess with Basil, 'a mystic advent of Christ,'—with Ambrose, 'the grace of His true Nature, and the sacrament of His true Flesh;'—with Chrysostom, 'grace flowing into the sacrifice,' and the 'grace of the Spirit,'—with Augustine, 'the invisible verity,

grace, and fellowship, of the members of Christ's Body.'—lastly, with Bertram, that the Body of Christ in the sacrament is the Spirit or power of the Divine Word, which not only feeds but purifies the soul. This is altogether different from holding nothing but a figure of Christ's Body^a."

The *Diallacticon*, commonly ascribed to Bishop Ponet, but which Dean Goode shews to have been written by Sir Anthony Cook, tutor to Edward VI., has the following:—

"Now in this sacrament the fathers of old time have noted two things, for either of the which it may well be called and accounted the Body of Christ, but especially when it comprehendeth them both. For both because the bread is a figure of the true Body, it is justly called His Body, and much more because it hath *the lively force of the same joined thereto*; but, in especial, because it comprehendeth both^b."

Again:—

"We said there was another thing which the ancient fathers acknowledging in this sacrament would have it verily to be the Lord's Body, and that is the virtue of the Body itself, that is of force and giveth life, which virtue by grace and mystical blessing is joined with the bread and wine, and is called by sundry names, when the matter itself is all one. Of Augustine, 'an intelligible, invisible, and spiritual body;' of Hierom, 'divine and spiritual flesh;' of Irenæus, 'a heavenly thing;' of Ambrose, 'a spiritual food,' and 'Body of a Divine Spirit;' of other, some such like thing. And this also doth make, much the more, that the sacrament is most worthy to have the name of the true

^a Reply to the three Articles at Oxford; Collier, App., No. lxxi. See also the *Reformatio Legum Ecc.*, c. ix.

^b Goode, 778.

Body and Blood, seeing not only outwardly it sheweth forth a figure and image of it, but also inwardly it draweth with it a hid and secret natural property of the same Body, that is to say, a virtue that giveth life: so that it cannot now be thought a vain figure, or the sign of a thing clean absent, but the very Body of the Lord, Divine indeed and spiritual, but present in grace, full of virtue, mighty in operation. And it happeneth often, that the names of the things themselves be given to their virtue and strength. We say leaven is in the whole lump, whereas a small quantity of leaven cannot spread so far abroad, but the strength and sharpness of the leaven. We say that the fire doth warm us, when the heat of the fire doth it, we being a good way off from the fire. Likewise that the sun is present, doth lighten, burneth, nourisheth, when indeed the heat of the sun doth it, and the sun himself cannot go out of his sphere. So is a king said to be in all his realm, because of the power of his dominion."

Of unworthy reception, the *Diallacticon* teaches, like S. Cyprian, that the grace is withdrawn, not from the sacrament but from the sinner:—

"If we consider the sacrament in itself, the Divine virtue cannot be absent from the sign; but if we consider the way of living and disposition of the receiver, that which is in itself life and grace is neither the one nor the other to *him*, because the pravity of wicked men is incapable of receiving so great goodness. Sacraments, while they remain sacraments, retain their virtue; and there can be no separation, whether they who receive them be good or bad, worthy or unworthy. But this only, so long as the sign serves for that use, and is applied to that end for which it is appointed by God's Word. For if we use it contrary to the institution of Christ, it either is no sacrament at all, or it ceases

to be one. Therefore they sin not a little who make use of the symbols of bread and wine, not for the purpose which Christ intended, but consecrate them for pomp, which is not allowed by the Word of God, and yet put them off for a sacrament to the silly people. For though they be prepared with due rites and for lawful ends, yet when that use and their proper function ceases, they no longer retain the name or virtue of sacraments."

Of the sacrifice it cites the words of S. Ambrose:—

"The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospels, the verity in Heaven^c," and after tracing them to Origen's comment on Psalm xxxviii., concludes that "the sacrifices which are offered here are images of that Verity who has entered into the heavens; and though these images have their verity also, it is different from the proper verity in heaven."

Of equal or greater authority in this reign was Edward the Sixth's Catechism, the undoubted production of *Ponet*, who was the first bishop consecrated according to the Reformed Ordinal^d.

^c De Off., i. 48.

^d The question lately raised on the private character of this prelate, is quite irrelevant to his value as a witness to the Church-teaching, of which he is admitted to have been an able and learned expositor. There are writers at present, who think to dispose of the Protestant Reformation by calling its authors "unredeemed villains." Cranmer is "a cowardly time-serving hypocrite, a perjured person and a traitor;" Edward VI. is a "tiger cub," though "the authority of Parliament in the second year of that king" is at other times the bulwark of our Catholic inheritance! These revilers seem to have forgotten Pope John X. and his paramours, with the more infamous Borgia's. Yet the morals of a pope are of greater importance to an infallible papacy, than the personal character of any bishop, prince, or doctor can be to the cause of Reformed religion.

“The supper is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ; forasmuch as the bread representeth His Body betrayed to be crucified for us, the wine standeth in the stead and place of His Blood plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the Body, that is the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life.”

In a sermon preached before the king, Ponet warmly combats the opinion that Christ's Body can be in sundry places at one time, ridiculing the school distinction of its being in the sacrament *realiter* and *substantialiter*, but not *naturaliter*. Still he maintains that the Body of Christ, which sits at the Father's right hand, is really present at the ministration of the sacrament :—

“Even as the sun, which is far off distant, is absent from mine eye, and yet is present to my sight, even so is Christ's Body absent from my mouth, and yet present to my belief. . . . And when I receive the Holy Communion, *mea conversatio est in cælis*, my conversation is in heaven, where Christ's Body is even so present to my faith as the sun is present to my sight, and as the bread and wine be present to my mouth. So that if I have no faith, Christ is not present to me when I receive the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Bishop *Bilson* expounding John vi. 51—54, held that unworthy communicants

“neither eat the Flesh of Christ nor drink His Blood; not because their teeth or jaws fail them, but by reason they

• Goode, p. 733.

† Ibid., p. 787.

want faith, which is the right and proper instrument of spiritual eating." He defines "sacramental eating" to be the "carnal and visible pressing with teeth the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood; it is not the real eating of Christ Himself." For this he cites S. Augustine's distinction between the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*. "Of the sacrament (he saith), It is received at the Lord's Table, of some to life, of some to destruction. *Res vero ipsa*, &c.—but the thing itself whereof that is a sacrament (is received) of all men to life, and of none to death, whosoever is partaker of it." . . . "The signs which are called after consecration by the names of Christ's Body and Blood, do enter our mouths and pass our throats; the true Flesh and Blood of Christ do not, but are eaten at the Lord's Table only of the inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there where He delighteth &."

The language of the Fathers that "our mouth receiveth the Body of Christ," Bilson reconciles by referring to the well-known habit of calling the signs by the name of the things signified^b:—

"For this cause the great Council of Nice directed the whole Church to lift up their understanding from the bread and wine which they saw, and by faith to conceive the Lamb of God slain for the sins of men, and proposed and exhibited on the Lord's Table in those mysteries; their words be¹: . . . which admonition the Church ever after observed, by crying upon the people to 'lift up their hearts,' not to the sacraments which they saw, but from them to Him that lived and reigned in heaven. Against them which defend

^a Goode, p. 790.

^b "True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," p. 753.

¹ See chap. ix., *infra*.

that this sacrament doth only figure not offer,—signify not exhibit, — grace, the letter may well be forced to prove the Divine power and operation of the mystical elements. Against us which hold the visible signs in substance to be creatures, in signification mysteries, in operation and virtue the things themselves whose names they bear, this illation concludeth nothing; . . . together with the name go the virtues of Christ's Flesh and Blood, united in manner of a sacrament to the visible signs. Since the substance of the creatures is not changed, the signs could not justly bear the names of the things themselves except the virtue, power, and effect of Christ's Flesh and Blood were adjoined to them, and united with them, after a secret and unspeakable manner, by the working of the Holy Ghost, in such sort that whosoever duly receiveth the sign is undoubtedly partaker of the grace. . . . And that spiritual force and grace, as Gregory saith, may very well be construed to be the *truth* of His Body and Blood in the mysteries^k."

Bishop *Jewell* :—

"We deny not but it may well be said that Christ at His Supper offered up Himself unto His Father; albeit not really and in deed, but in a figure or in a mystery; in such sort as we say that Christ was offered in the sacrifices of the old Law, and as S. John says, 'the Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world;' as Christ was slain at the Table, so was He sacrificed at the Table; but He was not slain at the Table verily and indeed, but only in a mystery^l."

Again :—

"The Eucharist is a sacrament, that is a visible symbol of the Body and Blood of Christ, in which is in a manner subjected to our eyes the death of Christ and His resurrection,

^k Goode, pp. 800—802.
land, Review, ch. xii. p. 337.

^l "Answer to Harding," Water-

and whatever He did in a human body; that we may give thanks for His death and our redemption, and in frequency of sacraments diligently renew the memory of that thing (*ejus rei*), that we may be truly nourished with the Body and Blood of Christ in hope of the resurrection and of eternal life, and that we may know for certain that the Body and Blood of Christ are to the nourishment of our souls what bread and wine are to the nourishment of our bodies^m."

Dr. William *Barlow*, afterwards Bishop of Rochester and Lincoln, writes A.D. 1601 :—

"Great difference there is (perchance not observed by many) between our eating of Christ and our uniting with Him. 1. We eat Him as our Passover, that as the Israelites ate the one, *mortuum et assum*, so we Him, *crucifixum et passum*, dead and slain. And so that speech of S. Austin is true: we have Him here in *pabulo*, as He was in *patibulo*, torn and rent; as Himself ordained the sacrament, *in pane fracto*, not *integro*, the bread broken not the whole loaf, thereby signifying, yea, saying, that in doing it we must remember Him, not as living among us, but as dying for us: *ut in cruce non in cælo*, as He was crucified not as He is glorified. Whereby we conclude first for His Presence, that His Body is so far forth there, *quatenus editur*, as it is eaten; but His Body is eaten as dead and slain; so Himself appointed it, 'This is My Body,' and stayeth not there, but adds withal, 'which is given for you.' And His Blood is drunk, not as remaining in His veins but as shed; so Himself speaketh, 'This is My Blood of the New Testament, *shed* for many.' Now His Body bruised, and His Blood poured out, can no otherwise be present in the Eucharist, but by a representation thereof in the bread broken, and

^m Apolog. Eccles. Angl.

in the wine effused, of the one side; and on the communicant's part by a grateful recordation of the benefits, a reverend valuation of the sacrifice, a faithful application of His merits in His whole Passion, and therefore His Presence must be sacramental and our eating spiritual; for *non quod videtur sed quod creditur pascit*, saith S. Austin.

"2. For the union we are united to Him *ut viventi*, as our living Head, *et nos vivificant*, and making us His lively members. It is true which Christ saith, that 'he which eateth My Flesh abideth in Me and I in him.' . . . But if we truly eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ, then, by the power of the Holy Ghost and faith co-operating, this union is strengthened; the vigour and effects whereof, after a true participation, we shall feel within ourselves more forcible and lively^a."

Bishop *Andrewes* maintains, against Bellarmine, that the Eucharist is

"a sacrifice of peace-offering, of which the law always was, that he who offers should partake of it; and he partakes by eating and drinking as the Lord commanded, for participation in prayers only is a novel and illicit sort of participation."

Again, in Sermon vii. on the Resurrection:—

"Two things Christ there gave us in charge; 1. remembering and 2. receiving: the same two S. Paul, but in other terms, 1. shewing forth, 2. communicating; of which remembering and shewing forth refer to *celebremus*, receiving and communicating to *epulemur*." . . . (The memorial is proved to be a sacrifice representative, (see p. 36 *sup.*) and proceeding to the second thing, he continues): "Will ye mark one thing

^a "Defence of the Articles of the Protestant Religion," p. 124; Waterland, Rev., ch. vii. p. 167.

more, that *epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus*; to Christ not every way considered, but as when He was offered. Christ's Body that now is, true, but not Christ's Body as now it is, but as it then was when it was offered, rent and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*, for He is immortal and impassible; but as He then was when He suffered death, that is passible and mortal. Then in His passible estate did He institute this of ours to be a memorial of His passible and *passio* both. And we are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ, as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering. So and no otherwise doth this text teach; so and no otherwise do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate in His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an Host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve. Christ offered is it: Thither must we look, to the serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*; we must, *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So and no otherwise is this *epulare* to be conceived. And so I think none will say they do or can turn Him."

In one place this great divine makes use of an expression which requires to be carefully compared with the context. The entire passage is as follows:—

"As there is a recapitulation of all in heaven and in earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the holy sacrament. You may see it clearly. There is in Christ the *Word* eternal, for things in heaven: there is also *flesh*, for things in earth. Semblably the sacrament consisteth of a heavenly and a terrene part (it is Irenæus's own

words), the heavenly, there the *word*, too, the abstract of the other, the earthly, the *element*. And in the elements you may observe there is a fulness of the seasons of the natural year; of the corn-floor (or harvest) in the one, *bread*; of the winepress (or vintage) in the other, *wine*. And in the heavenly, of the wheat corn, whereto He compareth Himself, *Bread*, even the living bread (or bread of life) that came down from heaven, the true manna, whereof we may gather each his *gomer*. And again of Him, the true Vine (as He calls Himself), the blood of the grapes of that Vine. Both these issuing out of this day's recapitulation, both in *corpus autem aptasti mihi* of this day. And the gathering of the vintage of these two in the blessed Eucharist, is (as I may say) a kind of hypostatical union of the signs and the thing signified, so united together as are the two natures of Christ. And even from this sacramental union do the Fathers borrow their resemblance, to illustrate by it the personal union in Christ. I name Theodoret for the Greek, and Gelasius for the Latin Church, that insist upon it, (both) and press it against Eutyches; that even as in the Eucharist, neither part is evacuate or turned into the other, but abide each still in his former nature and substance; no more is either of Christ's natures annulled, or one of them converted into the other (as Eutyches held), but each nature remaineth still full and whole in his own kind. And backwards; as the two natures in Christ, so the *signum* and *signatum* in the sacrament, *o converso*. And this later device, of the substance of the bread and wine to be flown away and gone, and in the room of it a remainder of nothing else but accidents to stay behind, was to them not known; and, had it been true, had made for Eutyches, and against them. And this for the likeness of union in both °."

The words of Irenæus will be considered hereafter: the present question is, what Andrewes understood by the "heavenly part" of the sacrament. If he meant, as some now suppose, the living Body or Person of Christ, he plainly teaches the Lutheran Presence. But it has been already shewn that in his view the Body of Christ glorified as He now is, is not the *signatum* of the sacrament, and would not serve its purpose; consequently, this is not what he holds to be united to the *signum*. Again, in this passage he interprets the heavenly part, not of Christ the Word eternal, but of a "word *the abstract of the other*," i.e. derived from Him. This can only mean the *spoken* word, to which the Fathers ascribe the consecration; that is, the words of Institution originally spoken by Christ Himself, and in their repetition, at each succeeding Eucharist, effectual through that original utterance, which (as Chrysostom says) still "works as the power of the Word on every Table to perfect the sacrifice^p." So, too, the well-known maxim of S. Augustine, "*accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*."

This word is here expressly distinguished from the Word eternal, as "the abstract of the other;" hence it is neither Christ Himself, nor either of His two natures. What the bishop says is, that it is united to the element as closely as the two natures are united in Christ; and this he terms "a kind of hypostatical union," with the further qualification "as I may say." It is not really a hypostatical union, because the "abstract word" is not a person; it is an illustration

^p Hom. de Prod. Jud. i. 6; see *infra*, chap. x.

or "likeness" of the personal union in Christ, which it could not be if it were itself hypostatic. It is the union of the *signum* with the *signatum*; and bearing in mind that this is *not* Christ glorified, but Christ on the cross—the *cadaver*,—it is clear that Andrewes meant by the "heavenly part" the grace or power operating in the consecration, to make the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ for the purposes of the sacrament; that is to say, for the remembrance of the sacrifice of His death, and the communion of the propitiation effected thereby. It is as true to say of the consecrated element, "this is Christ's Body," as to say of Christ, "this Man is the Son of God;" there is a "likeness of union in both." In short, the bishop *opposes* the sacramental union, as a parallel to the personal union, and therefore not *in eadem materia*; and his remark, "each man gathering his *gomer*," shews that he understood the true Manna to be spiritually eaten according to the proportion of faith, and by means of the sacrament, but not lodged within its material limits.

In the same Sermon we read :—

"It is not mental thinking or verbal speaking, there *must* be actually somewhat done to celebrate this memory. That done to the *holy symbols* that was done to Him, to His Body and His Blood, in the Passover:—break the one, pour out the other, to *represent* κλάμενον, how His sacred Body was broken, and ἐκχυνόμενον, how His precious Blood was shed.

"And in *Corpus fractum* and *Sanguis fusus* there is *immolatus*. This is it in the Eucharist that answereth to the sacrifice in the Passover—the Memorial to the figure. To them it was, *Hoc facite in mei præfigurationem*—'do this

in prefiguration of Me.' To us it is, 'Do this in commemoration of Me.' To them, *prænuntiare*; to us, *anuntiare*. There is the difference¹."

The Presence asserted is the mystical or sacramental presence indicated in the old word "antitypes;"—a presence of the sacrificed Body and Blood, in sacramental symbols, having the virtue, force, and efficacy (as Ponet writes) of the Passion annexed to them. Whether *per*, *in*, *cum*, or *sub*, is matter of opinion not of faith². Hence he prays that—

"He that breathed, and He that was breathed, may both of them vouchsafe to breathe into these holy mysteries a Divine power and virtue, and make them to us the bread of life and the cup of salvation: God the Father also sending His blessing upon them, that they may be His blessed means of this thrice blessed effect³."

Bishop Overall (cons. 1614), one of the translators of the Bible, and the author of the second part of our Church Catechism, writes:—

"There is no new sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to God by Christ in heaven, and continueth here still on earth by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, . . . and to appease His wrath towards us, to get blessings from Him, to make Christ's bloody sacrifice effectual unto us⁴."

¹ Dr. Pusey's "Letter to the Bishop of London," (1858), p. 45.

² Andrewes, Adv. Bell., i. 11.

³ Sermon ix. Of the Holy Ghost.

⁴ MS. Notes in Nicholls' C. P. Pusey's Letter, p. 44.

Again :—

“ In the sacrament of the Eucharist, or the Lord’s Supper, Christ’s Body and Blood, and so whole Christ, are indeed truly present and truly participated by us, truly also conjoined with the sacramental signs, as signs not only significative but also exhibitivæ; so that in the bread rightly given and received, the Body of Christ is given and received; and in the wine given and received, the Blood of Christ is given and received; and so whole Christ is communicated in the communion of the sacrament: but not in corporal, crass, earthly manner by transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or *any similar figments of human reason*; but in mystical, heavenly and spiritual manner, as is rightly taught in our Articles.”

The bishop does not say that the elements either are or signify whole Christ, but that His Body is given and taken in the bread, and His Blood in the wine, and so “ whole Christ ” is *communicated* in the Communion. This distinction is carefully marked in the Latin original.

“ In sacramento Eucharistiæ, sive cœnæ dominicæ Christi Corpus et Sanguinem, totumque adeo Christum vere quidem adesse, et vere a nobis participari, vereque conjungi cum signis sacramentalibus, ut cum signis *non solum significativis sed etiam exhibitivis*; ita ut in recte dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur Corpus Christi; dato et accepto vino, detur et accipiatur sanguis Christi; totusque adeo Christus in sacramenti *communione* communicetur; sed non modo corporali, crasso, terreno per transubstantiationem, aut consubstantiationem, similiave rationis humanæ commenta, sed modo mystico, cœlesti, ac spirituali, ut recte in articulis nostris præscriptum est.”—Campbell’s “ Middle State Explained,” London, 1713, p. 212; cited in the excellent Tract of Dr. Buel, Professor of Divinity in the General Theological Seminary, New York, p. 135.

Archbishop *Laud*, (cons. 1621):—

“Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist,” and in this particular Calvin ‘comes no whit short’ of Cranmer and Ridley.

“The Eucharist is a sacrament *Sanguinis effusi*, or blood shed and poured out. And Blood poured out, and so severed from the Body, goes not along with the Body *per concomitantiam*.

“My third instance shall be in the sacrifice which is offered up to God in that great and high mystery of our Redemption by the death of Christ. For as Christ offered up Himself once for all, a full and all-sufficient Sacrifice for the sin of the whole world, so did He institute and command a Memory of this Sacrifice in a sacrament, even till His coming again. For at and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices. One by the priest only^{*}, that is, the commemorative sacrifice of Christ’s death, represented in bread broken, and wine poured out. Another, by the priest and people jointly; and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ. The third, by every particular man for himself only; and that is the sacrifice of every man’s body and soul, to serve Him in both all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him.” In the note he cites Peter Lombard, that the thing done at God’s board is a sacrifice, and so is that also which was made upon the cross, but not after one manner of understanding. For this was the *thing indeed*, and that is the *Commemoration of the thing*. Such was the “unbloody sacrifice” of the

* This distinction is questioned by Waterland, because in this, as in all the office, the priest is the mouth of the congregation, who all join in the sacrifice. The archbishop meant that the priest has his own commission from Christ, whom he represents also.

Fathers; and this Bishop Jewel disliketh not in his answer to Harding †.

Bishop *Lake*, (A.D. 1629) :—

“The elements of bread and wine were consecrated that they might be the Body and Blood of Christ. But how are His Body and Blood to be considered? Surely not as Christ is glorified, but as He was crucified. For it is that Body that was given, (as S. Paul speaketh, ‘was broken,’) and the Blood is that blood which was shed.” . . . “The Church of Rome, not distinguishing between Christ crucified and glorified, or rather not building their conclusion answerable to this undeniable principle,—the sacraments represent Christ crucified, not glorified,—are driven to coin so many new articles: 1. of real presence corporal; 2. of a metaphysical transubstantiation; 3. of an ill-applied concomitancy. All which easily vanish, if we consider Christ’s purpose to represent Himself in the sacrament, not as He is now at the right hand of God, but as He was upon the Cross. Not but it is the same Body and Blood which is in glory, but it must not be so considered as it is in glory. Which will necessarily enforce us to acknowledge, that the union between the thing earthly and the thing heavenly can be no more than sacramental, and that respective also to what was done on earth, not what is in heaven; was, I say, done *formaliter* on the Cross, but is effective, working in heaven ‡.”

Archbishop *Bramhall*, (cons. 1633) :—

“We acknowledge a representation of that Sacrifice to God the Father; we acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it; we maintain an application of its virtue. So here is

† Fisher, s. xxxv. No. 7, pp. 2, 3.

‡ Sermons, p. ii. 167 ;—Goode, 836-7.

a commemorative, impetrative, applicative sacrifice. Speak distinctly, and I cannot understand what you can desire more. To make it a suppletory sacrifice, to supply the defects of the only true sacrifice of the cross, I hope both you and I abhor^a."

Again:—

"It was not for nothing that our Saviour did distinguish His Body from His Blood, not only in the consecration, but also in the distribution of the sacrament. . . . We dare not give divine worship unto any creature, no not to the very Humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the Host), but to the whole Person of Christ, God and Man, by reason of the hypostatical union between the child of the Virgin Mary, and the Eternal Son who is God over all blessed for ever. Shew us such an union betwixt the Deity and the elements, or accidents, and you say something; but you pretend no such things; the highest that you dare go is this,—as they that adored Christ when He was upon earth, did after a certain kind of manner adore His garments. Is this all? This is after a certain kind of manner indeed! We have enough. There is no more adoration due to the sacrament than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth. Exact no more^b."

Again:—

"What have we to do with Christ's heavenly priesthood in this question, which is to make intercession and atonement for us to His Father? . . . He mistakes Christ's heavenly priesthood for man's earthly priesthood. . . . Mr. Mason doth not say that the Protestants have pared away all manner of sacrifices. First, they acknowledge spiritual and

^a Ans. to M. de la Militière, Works, Dublin, 1677, p. 36; Pusey's Letter, p. 47.

^b Ibid., 20, 21.

Eucharistic sacrifices, prayers, praises, a contrite heart, alms, and the like. Secondly, they acknowledge a commemoration, or a representative sacrifice, in the Holy Eucharist. Thirdly, they teach that this is not a *nuda commemoratio*, a bare commemoration without efficacy, but that the blessed sacrament is a means ordained by Christ to render us capable, and to apply unto us the virtue of that all-sufficient sacrifice of infinite value which Christ made upon the cross, which is as far as the moderate Romanists dare go, in distinct and particular expressions. But the Protestants dare not say that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory in itself, by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy. Whatsoever power it hath, is in relation to the sacrifice of Christ, as a means ordained to apply that to true believers. In sum, the essence of the Roman sacrifice doth consist, according to the doctrine of their own schools, either in the consecration alone, or in the manducation alone, or both in the consecration and participation; but not at all either in the oblation before consecration, or in the oblation after consecration, or in the fraction, or mixtion. Seeing, therefore, that the Protestants do retain both the consecration and consumption, or communication, without all contradiction, under the name of a sacrament; they have the very thing which the Romanists call a sacrifice. How is the world amused with a shew of empty names to no purpose^c !”

Mede, (A.D. 1635) :—

“Instead, therefore, of the slaying of beast and burning of incense, whereby they called upon the Name of God in the Old Testament, the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour ordained the Sacrament of Bread and Wine as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to His Father in His Name. The mystery of which rite they took to be this:

^c Bramhall, (vol. iv. Disc. vi.) Works, p. 996.

That as Christ, by presenting His Death and satisfaction to His Father, continually intercedes for us in heaven, so the Church on earth semblably approaches the Throne of Grace, by representing Christ unto His Father in these holy mysteries of His Death and Passion. . . . These things thus explained, let us now see by what testimonies and authorities it may be proved the ancient Church had this meaning. I will begin with St. Ambrose, because his testimony is punctual to our explication." "Heretofore (under the Law) was wont to be offered a lamb and a bullock. But now (under the Gospel) Christ is offered; but He is offered as a Man and as one that suffered; and He also as a Priest offers Himself, for the forgiveness of our sins. Here (on earth) this is done in a resemblance and representation; there (in heaven) in truth, where He, as our Advocate, intercedes for us with His Father. An author which Casander in his 'Consultations' quotes without name, expresses this mystery fully:—'Christ is not wickedly slain by us, but piously sacrificed; and thus we shew the Lord's death till He come; for we by Him do that here on earth lowly, which He (as a Son to be heard for His reverence or piety) doth for us in heaven powerfully and prevailingly; where He as our Advocate mediates for us with the Father, whose office it is to intercede for us, and to present that flesh which He took for us, and of us, to God the Father in our behalf^d.'

Bishop Taylor, (1654):—

"That this was the sacrament of his death appears in the words of Institution, and by the preceptive words, *Do this in remembrance of Me*. And in the reason subjoined by S. Paul, *For so often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shew the Lord's death till He come*. Therefore, when

^d "Christian Sacrifice," chap. vi.; Pusey's Letter, p. 51.

Christ said, *This is My Body, given, or broken*, on My part; *taken, eaten*, on yours,—it can be nothing else but the *εἰκὼν*, the sacramental image of His death; to effect which purpose it could not be necessary or useful to bring His natural Body, that so the substance should become his own shadow; the natural presence be his own sacrament, or rather the image and representment of what He once suffered. His Body given in the sacrament is the application and memory of His death, and no more; that as Christ in heaven represents His death in the way of intercession, so do we by our ministry: but as in heaven it is wholly a representing of His body crucified, a remembrance of His crucifixion, of His death and passion, by which He reconciled God and man; so it is in the sacrament after our manner, *This is My Body given for you*; that is, ‘This is the sacrament of My death, in which My Body was given for you.’ For as Aquinas said, ‘in all sciences words signify things; but it is proper to theology, that things themselves signified or expressed by voices should also signify something beyond it.’ *This is My Body*, are the sacramental words, or those words by which the mystery or the thing is sacramental; it must therefore signify something beyond these words; and so they do, for they signify the death which Christ suffered in that Body. It is but an imperfect conception of the mystery to say it is the sacrament of Christ’s Body only, or His Blood; but it is *ex parte rei*, a sacrament of the death of His Body, and to us a participation or an exhibition of it, as it became beneficial to us, that is, as it was crucified, as it was our sacrifice. And this is so wholly agreeable to the nature of the thing, and the order of the words, and the body of the circumstances, that it is next to that which is evident in itself, and needs no further light but the considering the words and the design of the Institution *.”

* Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament, sect. vii. 7.

Again:—

“It is the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy, and means of impetration, in this world. For when Christ was consecrated on the cross, and became our High-Priest, having reconciled us to God by the death of the cross, He became infinitely gracious in the eyes of God, and was admitted to the celestial and eternal Priesthood in heaven; where, in the virtue of the cross, He intercedes for us, and represents an eternal sacrifice in the heavens on our behalf. That He is a Priest in heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of S. Paul. That there is no other sacrifice to be offered, but that on the cross, it is evident, because ‘He hath once appeared in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;’ and therefore, since it is necessary that He hath something to offer, so long as He is a Priest, and there is no other sacrifice but that of Himself offered upon the cross,—it follows that Christ in heaven perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to His heavenly Father, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for His Church.

“Now what Christ does in heaven, He hath commanded us to do on earth, that is, to represent His death, to commemorate His sacrifice, by humble prayer and thankful record; and by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist, to lay it before the eye of our heavenly Father, so ministering in His Priesthood, and doing according to His commandment and example: the Church being the image of heaven; the Priest the minister of Christ; the holy Table being a copy of the Celestial Altar, and the eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world being always the same. It bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here: by Christ’s action there, by His commandment here. And the event of it is plainly

this: that as Christ, in virtue of His sacrifice on the cross, intercedes for us with His Father, so does the minister of Christ's Priesthood here; that the virtue of the eternal sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the Church, both for things temporal and eternal. And therefore it was not without great mystery and clear signification, that our blessed Lord was pleased to command the representation of His death and sacrifice on the cross should be made by breaking of bread and effusion of wine; to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the Liturgy we are about, and that we minister in the Priesthood of Christ, who is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedech; that is, we are ministers in that unchangeable Priesthood, imitating in the external ministry the prototype Melchizedech, of whom it was said, he brought forth bread and wine, and was the Priest of the most high God; and in the internal imitating the antetype or the substance, Christ Himself, who offered up His Body and Blood for atonement for us, and by the sacraments of bread and wine, and the prayers of oblation and intercession, commands us to officiate in His Priesthood: in the external ministering like Melchizedech; in the internal after the manner of Christ Himself'."

Bishop *Patrick* (A.D. 1659) proves at length from the Fathers,—

"That the Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, which they speak of, is of His Body as crucified and slain and dead. Now this cannot agree to His natural Body, which by our adversaries' confession is impassible and invulnerable, now it is glorified, and cannot admit any separation of parts, which crucifixion does suppose." He cites as examples the famous passages of Chrysostom: "Christ lies

' "Worthy Communicant," i. iv.; Pusey's Letter, p. 38.

before us slain." "The sacrifice is brought forth, the Lord's Sheep is slain." "Thou seest the Lord slain and lying, and the priest standing by the sacrifice praying, and all the people purple-dyed in that precious Blood."

Of the Communion he says:—

"If it be worthily received, it is the Body and Blood of Christ; if unworthily, it is but bare bread and wine. But yet this must be cautiously understood, for His Presence is with the bread, though not *in* it. Though it be only *in* us, yet it comes with it *to* us if we will receive Him; because else we shall not know how unworthy persons are said to be guilty of His Body and Blood, if He be not present with His Body and Blood to work in men's souls^b."

And of the whole rite:—

"For remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) doth not barely signify recording or registering of His favours in our mind, but *commemoratio*, a solemn declaration that we do well bear them in our hearts, and will continue the memory and spread the fame of Him as far and as long as ever we are able. . . . 1. We do shew forth the Lord's death, and declare it unto men. 2. We do shew it forth unto God, and commemorate before Him the great things He hath done for us. We keep it as it were in His memory, and plead before Him the sacrifice of His Son which we shew unto Him, humbly requiring that grace and pardon, with all other benefits of it, may be bestowed upon us. And as the minister doth most powerfully pray in the virtue of Christ's sacrifice when he represents it unto God, so do the people also when they shew unto Him what His Son hath suffered. [It will not be unprofitable to add that this was one reason why the

^a Full View, &c. Gibson's "Preserv. against Popery," p. 213.

^b *Mensa Mystica*, i. 5.

ancients called this action a sacrifice, because it doth represent the sacrifice which Christ once offered]¹."

Again, this learned and moderate prelate writes,—

"When we shew forth the inestimable value of Christ's sacrifice we do, as it were, offer it unto God, or rather make before Him a commemoration of this offering. And in this sense the ancient Christians did call this sacrament a *sacrifice*, and every Christian they looked upon as a *priest* and a *sacrificer*, when he came to the Table of the Lord; because Christ not wholly bade His Apostles *do this in remembrance* of Him, but S. Paul requires every one of us to do the same, and to *shew forth His death till He come*¹."

For this he quotes S. Chrysostom on Heb. x., and Eusebius's Demonstration, which will be given in our eleventh chapter.

Bishop *Cosin* (cons. 1660), one of the Revisers of the Prayer-book, repeats the doctrine of his predecessors^k :—

The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist means His real reception into the soul of the communicant. There is no Presence to any but communicants, nor to them without faith¹. He adopts the great Protestant canon, that no sacrament has the virtue of a sacrament beyond the use ordained by God: and among the "abominable disputations" of the Romish schools, recited at the end of the tract, one is whether the Body of Christ can be moved up and down at the same moment?—elevated (that is) by one priest, and set down by another^m. Again, the virtue of the Body is

¹ Cited without the last sentence, in Pusey's Letter, p. 48, from Bp. Wilberforce's *Eucharistica*.

16th Ed. 1733, p. 22.

^k Hist. Trans. i. 1.

¹ Ibid. iv. 5.

^m Ibid. vii. 35.

given with the bread, and of the Blood with the wine. When the outward part of the sacrament is said to be changed into the inward and divine, it is only because it represents it truly and efficaciously. And this, he affirms, was the faith of antiquity for a thousand years^a.

In his "Notes on the Book of Common Prayer," Cosin thus comments on the kneeling at Communion:—

"If we take a sacrifice properly and formally, whether for the action of sacrificing (as it is this day taken by the Roman priests) [or for the thing sacrificed^o] then truly, although by the commemoration and representation it be the same numerical sacrifice with that which was offered on the cross, yet the action itself, or the oblation which is now made by us in the Eucharist, agrees neither in species nor genus with the oblation or immolation which was on the cross. For there is no form or reason of the oblation given which can be univocally predicated of that: for upon the cross the oblation was made by a true destruction and death of the live Thing, without which no sacrifice, properly so called, can be; but in our Eucharist there is a sacrifice made by prayers, a *commemoration*, and a *representation*, which is not properly called a sacrifice. But nothing hinders but that the Eucharist may be accounted and called the commemorative sacrifice of the proper Sacrifice of the death of Christ, which our Lord Himself hath taught us when He said, 'This do in remembrance of Me.'

"True it is that the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present when the blessed bread and wine are taken by the faithful communicant; and as true it is also that they are not present but only

^a Hist. Trans. vi. 1.
Bishop's note.

^o The alternative is omitted in the

when the hallowed elements are so taken, as in another work I have more at large declared. Therefore whosoever so receiveth them, at the time when he receiveth them, rightly doth he adore and reverence his Saviour, there together with the sacramental bread and wine, exhibiting His own Body and Blood unto him. Yet because the Body and Blood is neither sensibly present, (nor otherways at all present but only to those who are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally united,) the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements ^p."

Dr. Hammond, (d. 1660) :—

"This commemoration hath two branches, one of praise and thanksgiving to God for His mercy, the other of annunciation or shewing forth—not only first to men, but secondly and especially to God—this sacrifice of Christ's offering up His Body upon the cross for us. That which respecteth or looks towards men, is a professing of our faith in the death of Christ; that which looks towards God, is our pleading before Him that sacrifice of His own Son, and, through that, humbly and with affiance requiring the benefits thereof, grace and pardon, to be bestowed upon us. And then God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it ^q."

Dr. Brevint, (1673) :—

"Whereas the Holy Eucharist is by itself a sacrament, wherein God offers unto all men the blessings merited by the

^p Bishop Cosin, "Notes in Nicholls' Book of Common Prayer."

^q Cited in *Dr. Pusey's Letter*, p. 47.

oblation of His Son, it likewise becomes by our remembrance a kind of sacrifice also; whereby to obtain at His hand the same blessings, we present and expose before His eyes that same holy and precious oblation once offered. Neither the Israelites had ever temple, or ark, or mercy-seat, nor the Christians have any ordinance, devotion, or mystery, that may prove to be such a blessed and effectual instrument to reach to this everlasting Sacrifice, and to set it out so solemnly before the eyes of God Almighty, as the Holy Eucharist is. To men it is a sacred Table, where God's minister is ordered to represent from God his Master the Passion of His dear Son, as still fresh and still powerful for their eternal salvation; and to God it is an altar, whereon men mystically represent to Him the same sacrifice, as still bleeding, and still suing for expiation and mercy. And because it is the High-Priest Himself, the true Anointed of the Lord, who hath set up most expressly both this table and this altar for these two ends, namely, for the communication of His Body and Blood to men, and for the representation and memorial of both to God; it cannot be doubted but that the one must be most advantageous to the penitent sinner, and the other most acceptable to that good and gracious Father, who is always pleased in His Son, and who loves of Himself the repenting and sincere return of His children. Hence one may see both the great use and advantage of more frequent communion; and how much it concerns us, whensoever we go to receive it, to lay out all our wants and pour out all our grief, our prayers, and our praises before the Lord in so happy a conjuncture. The primitive Christians did it so, who did as seldom meet to preach or pray without a communion, as did the old Israelites to worship without a sacrifice. On solemn days especially, or upon great exigencies, they ever used this help of sacramental oblation as the most powerful means the Church had to strengthen their supplication, to open the gates of heaven,

and to force in a manner God and His Christ to have compassion on them^r."

Dean *Aldrich* (A.D. 1687) :—

"The natural Body of our blessed Saviour comes under a twofold consideration in the Eucharist:—1. *As a body dead*; under which notion we are said to eat it in the sacrament, and to drink the *Blood as shed*; as appears by the words of the Institution, 'Take and eat; this is My Body, which is given or broken for you:' 'Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood, which is shed for you:' in which words (as Mr. Bradford long ago observed) what God has joined we are not to put asunder. 2. *As a glorified Body*; in which condition it now sits at the right hand of God, and shall there continue till the restitution of all things, imparting grace and influence, and all the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of the dead Body, to those that (in the Holy Eucharist most especially) are through faith, and by the marvellous operation of the Holy Ghost, incorporated into Christ, and so united to Him, that they 'dwell in Christ, and Christ in them; they are one with Christ, and Christ with them; they are made members of His Body, of His flesh, and of His bones:' and by partaking of the spirit of Him, their Head, receive all the graces and benefits purchased for them by His bitter death and passion.

"Wherefore it is evident, that since the Body *broken* and the Blood *shed* neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten or drank, nor can we really receive *them*, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the Body which now exists, whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified Body, which is therefore verily and indeed received, (as we

^r "Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," Pusey's Letter, p. 41. See Waterland's "Christian Sacrifice Explained," Ed. Bp. Lond., p. 433, n.

shall see anon,) and by consequence said to be really present, notwithstanding its local absence; because a real participation and union must needs imply a real presence, though they do not necessarily require a local one*."

Thorndike :—

"If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, then are they the sacrifice of Christ crucified upon the cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of Christ as in His Body while it was whole, but as separated by the Passion of His cross. Not that Christ can be sacrificed again; for a sacrifice, being an action done in succession of time, cannot be done the second time, being once done; because then it should not have been done before; but because the sacrifice of Christ crucified is represented, commemorated and applied, by celebrating and receiving the sacrament, which is that sacrifice†."

Scrivener :—

"In like manner, and much more effectually, may we say that the action of the Eucharist presents to God the sacrifice of Christ's death and mediation made by Him for mankind, especially those that are immediately concerned in that sacrament; from which *metonymical* sacrifice what great and rich benefits may we not expect‡."

Bishop Fell, (cons. 1676) :—

"As also He hath instituted the same oblation of His holy Body and Blood, and commemoration of His Passion, to be made in the Holy Eucharist to God the Father by His ministers here on earth, for the same ends, viz. the appli-

* "Reply to Two Discourses," quoted with approval in Waterland's Review, chap. vii. p. 170.

† "Just Weights and Measures," p. 95, ed. 1680; Dr. Buel.

‡ Cited in Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 47.

cation of all the benefits of His sole meritorious death and sacrifice on the cross, till His second return out of this heavenly sanctuary *."

Bishop *Bull*, (cons. 1706), writes :—

"In the Eucharist, then, Christ is offered not hypostatically, as the Trent Fathers have determined, for so He was but once offered, but commemoratively only; and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering*or putting ourselves in mind of Him; for every sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the bread and wine as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious Body, (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy,) and plead to God the merit of *His Son's* sacrifice once offered on the cross for us sinners, and in this sacrament represented; beseeching Him, for the sake thereof, to bestow His heavenly blessings upon us. The Eucharistic sacrifice was believed in the ancient Church to be an *ἀνάμνησις*, or commemoration, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption: it could not therefore be then thought an offering up to God of the very Body and Blood of Christ, substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine; for these two notions are inconsistent, and cannot stand together. . . . Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal benediction, *the Spirit* of Christ, or a *divine virtue* from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants; and that therefore they are said to be, and are, the

* Cited in Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 34.

Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is *hypostatically* united to the Body of Christ in heaven, being *virtually* united to the elements of bread and wine on earth, which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies.”

Even Bishop *Burnet* asserts in the consecrated elements a

“Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, but not of His Body as it is now glorified in heaven, but of His Body as it was broken on the cross, when His Blood was shed and separated from it. . . . In this sense we acknowledge a Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament.”

Burnet, however, like Ridley, disliked the word “Real” as applied to the mystical Presence, and would have confined it to the gift to the faithful receiver, which all admit to be a Presence of the glorified Body by means of the Spirit.

Bishop *Beveridge*, (cons. 1704) :—

“The sacrifice that is most proper and peculiar to the Gospel, is the sacrament of our Lord’s Supper, instituted by our Lord Himself to succeed all the bloody sacrifices in the law. For though we cannot say, as some absurdly do, that this is such a sacrifice whereby Christ is again offered up to God both for the living and the dead, yet it may as properly be called a sacrifice as any that was ever offered, except that which was offered by Christ Himself; for His, indeed, was the only true expiatory sacrifice that was ever offered. Those under the law were only types of His, and were

” Works, ii. 22. The former part of this extract is quoted in the Privy Council Judgment in *Sheppard v. Bennett* (1872), as representing the doctrine of “many Divines of eminence.”

” Exp. XXXIX. Art. Goode, 672.

called sacrifices only upon that account, because they typified and represented that which He was to offer for the sins of the world. And, therefore, the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood may as well be called by that name as they were. They were *typical*, and this is a *commemorative*, sacrifice. They foreshadowed the death of Christ to come; this shews His death already past. 'For as often,' saith the Apostle, 'as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come.' This is properly our Christian sacrifice, which neither Jew nor Gentile can have any share in; as the Apostle observes, 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.' An altar where we partake of the great sacrifice, which the eternal Son of God offered up for the sins of the whole world, and ours among the rest^a."

To these may now be added the testimony of *Waterland*, who, if not entirely free from the rationalism of his age, had the merit of employing his great learning, and singular clearness of thought, in defence of Catholic antiquity, of which he left little or nothing unperused. He observes on the words of Institution, that—

"They cannot mean that this bread and wine are really and literally that Body in the same broken state as it hung upon the cross, and that Blood which was spilled upon the ground 1,700 years ago. Neither yet can they mean that this bread and wine literally and properly are our Lord's glorified Body, which is as far distant from us as heaven is distant; all sense, all reason, all Scripture, all antiquity, and sound theology reclaim against so wild a thought. . . .

"The bread and the wine are the Body and Blood (*viz.* the natural Body and Blood) in just *construction*, put upon them

^a Sermon viii., Works, vol. i. p. 149; Oxford, 1842.

by the Lawgiver Himself, who has so appointed, and who is able to make it good. The symbols are not the Body in power and effect, (he means, as explained just before, not by 'an inherent, or infused virtue resting upon the bare elements,') if those words mean efficiency: but, suitable dispositions supposed in the recipient, the delivery of these symbols is, in construction of Gospel law, and in Divine intention, and therefore in certain effect and consequence, a delivery of the things signified. . . . Those outward symbols are, though not literally, yet interpretatively and to all saving purposes, that very Body and Blood which they so represent with effect; they are appointed instead of them." And here he cites Victor Antiochenus (A.D. 401): "The cup is taken instead of the Blood," (*ἐν τῷ αἵματι αἶμαρος*). "This will appear still plainer from the sacrificial language and usage in the Old Testament. Blood, in sacrificial language, was the life of an animal; and the shedding the blood for sacrifice, together with the sprinkling it, were understood to be giving life for life^b. . . . The altar was considered as God's table; and what was offered upon it and consumed by fire was construed and accepted as God's meat^c. Not that it was literally so, but it was all one to the supplicants; . . . it was symbolically the same, and therefore so named. . . . When the people feasted on the peace-offerings, it was symbolically eating peace, and maintaining amity with God; to which S. Paul alludes in a noted passage^d to be explained hereafter. From hence it may be observed by the way that symbolical phrases, and symbolical services, were what the Jews had been much and long used to, before our Lord's time, which may be one reason why the Apostles shewed no surprise at what was said to them at the Institution of the Eucharist. . . . In the Eucharist the Sacrament is the

^b Gen. iv. 4; Lev. xvii. 10, 11.
 xxi. 6, 8, 17, &c.

^c Lev. iii. 11;

^d 1 Cor. x. 18.

communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; . . . there is communication from God, and a participation by us, of Christ's crucified Body directly, and of the Body glorified consequentially. . . . The unworthy receiver is guilty, not only of profaning holy things (as even the symbols themselves when consecrated are holy), but also of slighting and contemning our Lord's own Body and Blood, which had been symbolically offered to him."

After noticing the chief Fathers of the first four centuries, he continues:—

"All intended to say, that the elements, keeping their own nature and substance, and not admitting a coalition with any other bodily substance, are symbolically, or in mystical construction, the Body and Blood of Christ, being appointed as such by Christ, accepted as such by God the Father, and made such in effect by the Holy Spirit to every faithful receiver. So ran the general doctrine from the beginning and downwards; neither am I aware of any considerable change made in it till the dark ages came on,—the eighth, ninth, tenth, and following centuries*."

Commenting on 1 Cor. x. 16, Waterland writes:—

"The Apostle's account of it is briefly expressed, in its being a communion of Christ's Body and Blood; that is to say, of the Body considered as broken, and of the Blood considered as shed; as is very plain from the terms of the Institution; and it is not improbable that the Apostle here so distinctly mentioned both, to intimate that they were to be considered as divided and separate, which was the case at His crucifixion, and not after. . . . The text speaks not of two bodies or bloods as present in the Sacrament. The symbolical Body and Blood (bread and wine) are there

* Review, chap. vii.

present, the rest is present only in a figure, or under certain construction. A mystical union of Christ's glorified Body with our bodies is indeed intimated in the text, or may by just consequence be inferred from it; but the direct doctrine of the text relates only to the Body as crucified, and the Blood as shed; and therefore here the proper distinctions should be made between the eating Christ's dead Body, and the uniting with His living Body¹."

This distinction, often insisted upon by Waterland, has of late been obstinately denied by a few English writers. But it lies at the very root of the controversy against the corporal Presence, and is plain on the face of Scripture and the Catholic liturgies.

On the sacrifice, *Waterland* manfully vindicates the primitive doctrine against the misconceptions alike of Romanists and foreign Protestants²; though on one point he will be found inconsistent both with himself and his authorities. Of the ancient oblations before and after consecration, he says:—

"The *Ante*-oblation has three parts, or views; 1. There is a presenting to God alms for the poor, and oblations for the use of the Church; . . . 2. There is in the Eucharist a presenting to God (virtually at least), an acknowledgment of His being the Creator and Giver of all good things, as Irenæus intimates³. . . . 3. There is also a presenting of the elements to God for consecration. . . .

"The *Post*-oblation, otherwise called Commemoration, may likewise be considered under three views, or as containing three parts; 1. The first is the offering to view, viz., of God, angels, and men, under certain symbols, the

¹ Review, chap. viii.

² Ibid., chap. xii., and "Christian Sacrifice Explained," Charge, (1738).

³ See *infra*, chap. xi.

death, passion or sacrifice of Christ. . . . 2. The second is the offering (as it were) to Divine consideration, with our praises and thanksgivings, Christ and His sacrifice, pleading the merit of it in behalf of ourselves and others. . . . 3. The third is the offering up Christ's mystical Body the Church, or ourselves a part of it, as a holy, lively, reasonable sacrifice unto God: a sacrifice represented by the outward signs, and conveyed, as it were, under the symbols of bread and wine."

Most of these spiritual sacrifices, he observes, are more or less common to the other Sacrament of Baptism.

"Nevertheless, the sacrament of the Eucharist has more particularly obtained the name of Sacrifice; partly on account of the offerings to Church and poor in the ante-oblation, which are peculiar to that sacrament; and partly on account of the commemorated Sacrifice in the post-oblation. For though Baptism commemorates the death and burial, and indirectly the grand Sacrifice, yet it does not so precisely, formally, and directly represent or commemorate the Sacrifice of the cross as the Eucharist does¹."

Our citation omits some passages referring to a distinction introduced in Waterland's controversy with Johnson. The latter maintained that the Eucharistic oblation was nothing but bread and wine. Waterland, rightly regarding these to be the signs of a mystical and spiritual offering, went so far on the other hand, as to contend they made no part of the sacrifice at all. The sacrifice of alms (he insisted) consists entirely in the intention of the offerer; the money is

¹ Appendix to Charge on Christian Sacrifice, A.D. 1738, p. 481.

really no part of it: and in like manner the bread and wine are no part of the Eucharistic oblation, which consists *exclusively* in the representation of Christ's Death, and the spiritual devotions of the Church.

This divorce of the signs from the things signified, he supported by the rationalistic argument that God has no need of material gifts, and by Luther's sophism that He does not in fact receive what we consume ourselves. It may be said with equal truth that God has no need of spiritual worship; and that He did not in fact receive the offerings consumed on the altar, or in the sacrificial feasts of the law. In like manner, it might be argued that words are no part of prayer, and even that God has no need of prayer, seeing He knows our wants before we speak, and cannot learn anything from His creatures. There was never any other difference, than the use of a material symbol, between sacrifice and prayer; and the symbol is as needful to the one as words to the other. It is the symbol indeed (as S. Augustine observes) that all men call sacrifice; and though he insisted (with the prophets) on the invisible sacrifices it denoted, yet neither he nor they ever questioned the universal nomenclature, or thought of excluding the sign from the sacrifice, of which it was the distinguishing feature. The truth is, that the Eucharistic oblation, so far as the sacramental action extends, is really bread and wine, and is so called in all the old liturgies. The invisible offerings it represents are the spirit and soul of the act, but the act itself is the presentation of the appointed signs. The endeavour to substitute the things

signified in their place, was the mistake that formulated Transubstantiation^k.

Bingham, whose learning may compare even with *Waterland's*, describes the priest's office in the early Church as including—

“the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; that is, as Mr. Mede and others explain them, First, the Eucharistical oblations of bread and wine, to agnize or acknowledge God to be the Lord of the creatures; then the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving, in commemoration of Christ's bloody Sacrifice upon the cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine; which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar^l.”

These extracts are given at sufficient length to avoid injustice to the authors; and they will be found to exhibit, with the freedom of thought that characterises our Divines, a satisfactory amount of concurrence on the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

^k *Waterland's* quotations from the Fathers to prove spiritual sacrifice, are as irrelevant as similar citations from the Psalms and Prophets. The question is, Did the writers *disown* material sacrifice? And this the liturgies (Levitical and Christian) answer in the negative. The answer of *Irenæus* to the rationalistic argument is complete: “*Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus;*” see chap. xi. *infra*. *S. Augustine's* denial that the elements are offered *per se ipsa*, was the proper answer to *Johnson*, if *Waterland* rightly understood him. The attempt to exclude them altogether is curiously enough repeated, from an opposite extreme to *Waterland*, in the “Objective” theory examined in our next chapter.

^l *Antiquities*, Bk. II. c. xix. s. 15.

A variation arose at the beginning of the seventeenth century, which, combining with a wish for more definite ritual expression, resulted in a new Liturgy, after the Non-jurors had been forced out of the Establishment. Waterland identifies this view with the doctrine of the modern Greeks^m. It is expounded in Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice," a work of extraordinary research, undertaken as a new and independent study of Catholic antiquity, with an avowed disregard of all modern arguments, Romanist or Protestant. This exercise of private judgment may be compared to Richard Baxter's, when he presented a Liturgy of his own composition to the Savoy Conference, as a substitute for the existing Church formularies. Johnson's doctrine differed (as might have been anticipated) from the conclusions, on both sides, of the controversy which he disdained to study. He not only rejected Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, but declared against the Real Presence altogether, spiritual as well as corporal. On this point his language was below that of Zwingli himself:—

That our Saviour commanded His disciples to eat that very Body of His that was given or offered for them on the cross, he treats as the "gross error of transubstantiation, or one of the other odd conceits of the Lutherans and Calvinists. The sacrifice of the cross has now no being in the nature

^m Charge to the Clergy of Middlesex, A.D. 1739; Bishop of London's reprint, p. 492. Just before, he supposes it borrowed from Damascene of the eighth century, or from the more modern Greeks, or the Pseudo-primitive Liturgies, (p. 489). The prodigious learning of this great divine did not include much liturgiology. In the Synods of Jassy (A.D. 1643) and Jerusalem (A.D. 1672), the Greek Church adopted Transubstantiation, but probably with no clear idea of what they were doing.

of things; for the Body and Blood of Christ, as they are represented in the Eucharist separate from each other, are now nowhere in the universe."

In place of inferring from this unquestionable fact that they are offered mystically and commemoratively, Johnson insists they are not offered at all. At the same time, he asserted the reality of the Eucharistic sacrifice with an earnestness that drew upon him the censure of Waterland, and caused the ultra-Protestants to suspect him of popery. No calumny was ever more groundless. Instead of abolishing the bread and wine in the sacrament, Johnson recognised nothing else. He admitted no *res sacramenti*. It is a sacrifice and participation of bread and wine, and nothing else. As a symbol of the sacrifice of the cross, it imparts to the communicant all the benefits of His death and resurrection; but the elements are the Body and Blood only in name: they are honoured with those titles, because they are the means of conveying the benefits of the cross; still, it is bread and wine that are offered in the Eucharistic sacrifice, and bread and wine, not the Body and Blood, that were verily and indeed taken in the Supper.

His idea was that the Eucharist represents the Supper and not the cross. Our Lord instituted in the paschal chamber a symbolical sacrifice of bread and wine, to represent His death and impart its benefits: this is the whole force of the Eucharist. So far from being the same sacrifice with that of the cross, it is as distinct from it as any Levitical rite. It symbolises the cross, but is no more the same sacrifice than the

Passover was. Johnson saw clearly enough the great truths of antiquity which had been lost sight of in the Tridentine dogma, 1. that the sacrifice of the cross is the one sole propitiation for sin ; 2. that the visible *oblata* in the Eucharist are bread and wine ; 3. that they symbolise the severed Body and Blood of the cross, not the whole living Humanity in heaven. He fully held also that spiritual union with Christ, and all other benefits of His Passion, are communicated to the worthy receiver of the sacrament.

Where he stumbled was in the article of the Presence. Like the Romanists, he confounded presence with *existence*. Because the Body and Blood no longer *exist* in the condition represented in the Eucharist, he argues they cannot be so *present*. Just so the Romanist argues conversely, that because Christ is present in the use, the elements are His Body in the condition now existing. The logical result is to make *two* sacrifices of Christ ; one in the Supper, which is the sacrifice of the Eucharist ; the other on the cross, of which we receive the benefit in communicating of the Eucharist.

“ If Christ had never offered any but His natural Body, then, it must be confessed, this argument would be of some weight. But now the sum and substance of the true doctrine of the Eucharist I take to be this : that what Christ offered to God and gave to His disciples to eat, was consecrated bread ; and that the reason why He honoured it with the *title* of His Body was because He did, in offering the bread to God, in His own intention offer His Body as a sacrifice for the sins of men ^a. ”

^a “ Unbloody Sacrifice,” part ii. Pref.

In like manner, Johnson reduced the Communion itself to a merely figurative action. Instead of a feast on the true Sacrifice of the cross, he made it a feast on the symbolical sacrifice of the Supper. He says expressly,—

“ Unless the consecrated bread and wine be the sacrifice on which we feast, it is certain that both the sacrifice and the feast must be a mere airy notion *.”

At the same time, he insists that Christ offered but one sacrifice once for all:—

“ He began this oblation in the Eucharist, and continued it on the cross. Nothing but His death could be a satisfaction for our sins, and this was actually accomplished on the cross. And this death of His was never to be repeated; it was the effect of His personal oblation of Himself, which He began in the Eucharist; and since He was but once to offer, He was but once to die. It seems clear to me that the one personal oblation, performed by our Saviour Himself, is not to be confined to any one instant of time, but commenced with the paschal solemnity, and was finished at His ascension into heaven, there to appear in the presence of God for us P.”

The peculiarity of this view is that it makes the Eucharist exhibit and communicate, not the Body and Blood of the cross, but the bread and wine “honoured with those titles” in the paschal chamber; and to this effect Johnson interprets these names throughout the Fathers. It is true that he holds the bread and wine to be the Body and Blood of the cross “in power and effect,” by virtue of the Institution;

* “Unbloody Sacrifice,” part ii. Pref.

P Ibid., cap. ii. sect. i.

but they represent *directly* the Supper, and only *indirectly* the cross. He avows that his doctrine "is not only inconsistent with Transubstantiation, (and Consubstantiation,) but with that Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, which is the common opinion of Protestants abroad¹."

It was unfortunate for Johnson that his power of exposition was by no means equal to his erudition, and it is not improbable that he has been misunderstood. Waterland hits the blot in his system by the remark that it makes the Eucharist a *substitute* for the sacrifice of the cross, instead of a representation and instrument to communicate it. This undue exaltation of the symbols provoked Waterland to the opposite error of excluding them from the sacrifice altogether. Both cited S. Augustine, but were too eager to keep by his definition.

Nothing certainly could be further than Johnson's view from the sacrifice of the Mass. Yet it was based on the same fundamental error, of supposing that nothing is *communicated* in the Holy Eucharist but that which is there *sacrificed*. The Romanists, holding a real participation of the Sacrifice of the cross, insist also on a real oblation of it. Johnson, perceiving the oblation to be mystical and symbolical, reduced the participation to the same character. The true doctrine of a *symbolical oblation*, and a *Real Communion*, escaped both.

¹ "Unbloody Sacrifice," Preface to 2nd Part, ii., iii.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NEW OBJECTIVE THEORY.

AFTER so many painful disputations, it was to be hoped that a new theory of sacramental Presence would never again be attempted. The Church of England had especial reasons for accepting the exhortation of her most judicious divine, "Let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, hitherto in this cause but over patiently heard, let them take their rest^a." The Blessed Sacrament had risen to a degree of reverence among our people, not surpassed in any Church since the primitive ages. Its celebration was becoming daily more frequent and devout. The cavils of the Puritans were forgotten; the rationalistic explanations of the eighteenth century were almost everywhere superseded by higher and holier expositions of Catholic truth; and at no time since the Reformation was the Liturgy so loyally rendered, both in doctrine and ceremonial. At such a time it is peculiarly distressing that the hope of still higher unity, in this central bond of light and love, should be imperilled by new scholastic definitions.

The "*Real Objective Presence*" is a phrase which has never been distinctly explained; it is not found

^a Eccl. Pol., V. lxvii. 12.

in any of our elder divines, nor is there any equivalent to it in the Fathers; hence it cannot escape the suspicion which justly attaches to every innovation on the terminology of the Church. We are not now to learn that new and unauthorized words imply new and unauthorized conceptions.

The new term is put forward in supersession of the recognised distinction of *corporal* and *spiritual*; it is not clear at first sight to which of those antagonistic terms it is most closely allied. Its authors wish to mark more emphatically the *reality* of the sacramental Presence, but when interrogated whether it is a *corporal* or *spiritual* reality, their language is found ambiguous and inconclusive.

The term itself is a metaphysical one, coined by the German philosophers, and imported into English theology within the last thirty years, to indicate a Presence independent of the worshipper, in opposition to one within his own mind, which they call a *subjective* impression.

It is another attempt, like those of the mediæval schoolmen, to subject a *Divine* Presence to metaphysical distribution. God is present with all His works, and all things live and move in Him; yet He is neither contained in matter, nor subject to mind. When the soul seeks communion with its Maker, His Presence is not the offspring of imagination, but the Real Presence of a different and higher Personality. And when we contemplate Him in His own perfections, He is still none the less in ourselves. The metaphysical ideas of objectivity and subjectivity are therefore radically inapplicable to the sacramental Presence; and

the introduction of the words can only tend to substitute some vague indeterminate conception, in place of recognised truth^b. Such conceptions are always fluctuating; an inaccurate terminology is necessarily ambiguous, and ambiguous words easily exceed the arbitrary limits originally assigned to them.

The reason assigned for the innovation is this:—

“Finding that the words ‘Real Presence’ were often understood of a ‘Real Absence,’ we added the word ‘Objective,’ not as wishing to obtrude on others a term of modern philosophy, but to express that the life-giving Body, the *res sacramenti*, is by virtue of the consecration present without us^c.”

Here it is admitted that a term of “modern philosophy” has been privately imported into the Eucharistic doctrine with a view to restrict the teaching to an interpretation not generally received. Such an attempt carries with it its own condemnation; it will be further found to involve a complete misapprehension of the metaphysical term so rashly appropriated.

In the mediæval philosophy which the schoolmen derived out of Aristotle, every material object was held to contain, under the “forms” cognizable to the

^b It is to be regretted, therefore, that an Oxford Divinity Professor should permit himself to defend the subjective Presence *against* the objective. The novelty ought to be firmly resisted; and I rejoice to learn that the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, having unguardedly employed the new phrase in his Bampton Lectures, has since withdrawn it.

^c Dr. Pusey’s Sermon preached at Oxford, Fifth Sunday after Easter, 1871.

senses, an inner *subjectum*, which constituted the real nature or substance of the thing. The *objectum* was the form it exhibited to the observer. Hence the Body of Christ was conceived to be the *subjectum* of the Eucharist, contained under the "forms" of bread and wine. To Peter Lombard or Thomas Aquinas an objective presence would have meant the presence manifested to the senses, and a subjective presence the hidden reality veiled under the accidents of the consecrated elements. This is as nearly as possible the reverse of what is meant by the terms in the present use. Our own divines, so far as they have used the words, appear to follow the old acceptation. Thus Mede observes of the Eucharistic sacrifice, that—

"though the Eucharist be a sacrifice, that is, an oblation wherein the offerer banquets with his God, yet is Christ in this sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of His sacrifice once offered on the cross; as a learned prelate of ours hath lately written, *objective* only, not *subjective* ^d."

That is to say, not as a subject contained in the consecrated elements, but as an object of contemplation to God and the Church.

Bishop Pearson also, in demonstrating the pre-existence of Christ from John i. 1, after shewing that in the sentence "in the beginning was the Word," the verb denotes an actual existence, demands why in the next sentence, ("the Word was with God,") the same verb should signify "an *objective* being only?" mean-

^d Mede's "Christian Sacrifice." The prelate referred to was Bishop Morton, (cons. 1616).

ing an existence in the Divine purpose, but not yet in historical fact^o.

The same terminology was retained in the Cartesian philosophy; but Kant and Fichte exactly *inverted* it, by removing the standpoint from the object to the observer. They distributed existence into the *ego* and the *non ego*; the *ego*, or whatever is internal to the thinker, they called "subjective," and all that is external to him, "objective." It would be a mistake to infer, from this distinction between the thought and the fact, that the objective only is real, and the subjective imaginary. On the contrary, the thought is our only measure of the fact, and so far the subjective may be more real, i.e. more true, than the objective, which is only inferred from the subjective. The sight, the touch, the smell are subjective impressions, from which the mind infers an objective existence as the cause of them. Hence a strict separation between them seems impossible, and the attempt has only led to confusion¹. Professor Ferrier has pointed out that "the object of cognition is never matter *per se*, but matter *plus* the mind's perception of it,"—as he quaintly expresses it, "not thing absolutely but thing *mecum* ²." It hardly needs to be added, that very possibly "Thing" may be really quite another thing, or the cognition may be wholly of "Me." At all events, only physical experiment can determine how much is due to the

^o Pearson on the Creed, Art. II.

¹ "The unhappy disjunction of subjective from objective, of idea from appearance, of history from speculation, has brought the national mind (of Germany) into great confusion."—Bunsen's *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 412.

² "Philosophical Remains."

absolute matter, and how much to the mental perception.

If these difficulties, then, beset the attempt to separate between the objective and the subjective in the field of *existence*,—for it must be observed that it is of “being” that the German metaphysics attempt to determine,—they are infinitely increased when the terms are transferred to the very different notion of *Presence*. Presence implies not so much absolute existence, as the recognition or perception of it by a conscious observer. Many things exist in the depths of the ocean, which are not present to the voyager on its surface. The sun is not present to the blind; and when chemical analysis discloses the presence of minerals in water, it means their discovery; the failure of all tests of their presence is scientific proof of their *absence*. In like manner, the metaphysicians would pronounce an objective being to be absent, if there were no subjective recognition of its presence.

Such is certainly the language of religion with regard to the Divine Presence. When the Psalmist says, “Thou art about my bed and about my path, and spiest out all my ways,” he is not asserting the Divine attributes of omnipresence and omniscience, so much as his own adoring recognition of them. And when Moses prays, “let Thy Presence go with me,” his desire was for a larger manifestation, in his own soul, of the great Being whose existence he knew to be indefeasible. So again S. Paul besought the Athenians to seek the Lord if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us. To be “without Christ,” is not to know Christ;

and our translators use the same way of rendering the stronger word 'atheists^h.' So far as relates to objective existence, His eternal power and Godhead are shewn in all His works; and the Gentiles were without excuse for not discerning Him. It was the want of subjective recognition, which constituted and perpetuated the exclusion of His Presence.

The result is that an "objective Presence" is philosophically a contradiction in terms. It is the old confusion which led the Romanists to Transubstantiation, and Johnson to a denial of the Real Presence. The truth is, that the word so borrowed from modern philosophy has been invested with another meaning by the way. The objective Presence now asserted is not merely a presence absolutely, irrespectively of the observer—that is denoted by *real*—it is a Presence *in the object of sense*, identical with the *subjectum* of the schoolmen.

One of the first to write of it was the accomplished and much-lamented Archdeacon Wilberforceⁱ. In his "Doctrine of the Incarnation," (1848), we read,—

"When spiritual presence is spoken of, there are two notions which may suggest themselves. Such presence may either be supposed to result from the action of the mind, which receives an impression, or from the action of the being who produces it. The first would be a subjective and metaphorical, the second is an objective and real presence.

^h Eph. ii. 12.

ⁱ A man whose great learning was united with the deepest piety, and to whose goodness and kindness the present writer, in common with all who enjoyed the privilege of his friendship, is under lasting obligations.

"Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus
Tam cari capitis."

... A real Presence is when there is some object external to ourselves which produces upon us those effects which result from its propinquity. And such presence may be said to be spiritual, as well as real, when the medium of communication, by which this external object affects or is present with us, is not material contact but spiritual power^j."

Here the words "objective" and "subjective" are plainly superfluous. The doctrine maintained is simply the old real and spiritual Presence;—*real* because the effect of an object external to ourselves; and *spiritual*, because the medium of communication is "not material contact, but spiritual power." Such a Presence the archdeacon ascribes to the sacrament of Baptism, no less than to the Eucharist; and he follows Hooker in deriving it from our Lord's human nature *in heaven*, as the channel of mediation between God and man.

"When we speak therefore of spiritual Presence in sacraments, what we refer to is not the vivacity of our spirits, which are able to fancy what is not truly near, but that spiritual power which was bestowed upon Christ's Manhood when it was personally united to God. . . . It may be asserted, then, respecting both sacraments, that their efficacy results from that spiritual power by which Christ's Manhood is truly present, that in both of them some real external gift is bestowed upon mankind^k."

This is the doctrine of all our old divines, and of the Fathers before them; there was no occasion for a new metaphysical term to express it.

Since then, the word "spiritual" has been dropped, and "objective" is now joined with "real," as if to de-

^j "Doctrine of the Incarnation," p. 433.

^k *Ibid.*, p. 435.

note some additional conception. The Real Objective Presence, instead of being predicated of both sacraments alike, is now limited to the Eucharist; and we are told that the Presence by "efficacy and spiritual power," which Archdeacon Wilberforce learnt from the Fathers and the Anglican divines, is in fact a Real Absence. The Real Objective Presence, in short, means a (so-called) Presence *within the material limits* of the consecrated elements. This is the old corporal Presence, only explicable on the Tridentine theory of conversion, or the Lutheran one of co-existence¹.

Now be this tenet true or false, it is not properly denoted by the word "objective," and it is simply begging the question to stigmatize its opponents as maintaining a Real Absence. No one doubts that the Person of Christ exists "without us," or that His Presence in the Eucharist is a gift vouchsafed to us from without, not simply a sentiment of our own hearts. On the other hand, the notion that He is personally in the elements is quite as much a *subjective* faith, as that which receives them as sacraments and means of His personal indwelling in ourselves. His Presence means the manifesting of Himself to faith, and the Presence of His Body and Blood implies the "discerning" and receiving, in their proper symbols, those two pledges of

¹ "Corporal is not equivalent to real and essential. It is not only associated with grosser and more carnal ideas, but in its strict philosophical meaning implies also something *local in the sense of filling a certain space*."—*Euch. Ador.*, p. 37. This is exactly what is meant by the objective theory, and it naturally reverts to the formula designed to express it, "under the forms of bread and wine," since these unquestionably "fill a certain space."

His sacrificed Humanity, and therein all the benefits of His Passion. It is not a question of present or absent, but whether the Person of Christ, i.e. His whole Being, is enclosed within the material limits of the instruments by which His Presence is vouchsafed. This is the old error which we have exposed in a previous chapter. It results from the confusion of ideas, which leads the Objectivist to imagine, like the Romanist, that he is sacrificing a Divine Person or "Presence," when he is making an oblation of the things by which the Presence is manifested. Indeed, a later disciple avows that "Objective" not only means what used to be called "corporal," but includes the tenet of Transubstantiation itself; it being quite a mistake to suppose there is any difference between the Anglican and Roman Churches on the doctrine of the Real Presence!

An authentic enunciation of the Objective theory, styling itself a "profession of faith," addressed to the late Archbishop of Canterbury^m, claims to state what the subscribers

"believe to be the mind of our Lord, as expressed in Holy Scripture, and as received by the Church of England in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church in those ages to which the Church of England directs us as 'most pure and uncorrupt,' and of the 'old godly doctors,' to whom she has in many ways referred us."

This somewhat overweening language is not supported by a single citation or authority from antiquity, and by only a few dislocated extracts from our own

^m Appendix to First Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual.

formularies. No explanation is offered of the term "Objective," though certainly unknown to any church, father, or doctor, ancient or modern; but on the dogma which it is meant to denote, we read as follows:—

"We repudiate the opinion of 'a corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood,' that is to say, of the Presence of His Body and Blood as they 'are in heaven;' and the conception of the mode of His Presence, which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, commonly called Transubstantiation. We believe that in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, 'the inward part or thing signified,' are present, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under 'the outward visible part or sign' or 'form of bread and wine.'"

This article, it will be observed, avoids the point of the controversy, whether the Presence is by material contact or by spiritual power, i.e. whether it is corporal or spiritual. The corporal Presence it repudiates is one that was never affirmed: neither Romanists nor Lutherans believe that Christ's natural Flesh and Blood are present in the sacrament "as they are in heaven." On the contrary, they assert it to be in a manner altogether different, and peculiar to the Eucharist. They say that Christ's real Body is present in the matter of the sacrament, i.e. it operates by material contact; while the Church of England says, in the rubric, misquoted by the memorialists, that His Body and Blood "are in heaven, *and not here*, it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at the same time in more places than one." This is

certainly widely different from the disclaimer of the manifesto.

Equally ineffective is the repudiation of the *word* Transubstantiation: for in the first place it might only substitute the Lutheran for the Tridentine "conception;" and in the next, the disclaimer is so encumbered by the epithets "physical" and "commonly called," as to leave it doubtful whether the Tridentine doctrine be excluded after all ⁿ.

If the words Body and Blood of Christ mean in this paper—as they ought to mean—the crucified Flesh of Christ, and not as the Romanists and Lutherans teach, His glorified Person, it must follow that they are "really and truly present" in mystery, not in substance—i.e. in spiritual power, not by material contact. This is the Catholic and Anglican doctrine. But this interpretation is shut out by the scholastic formula, "under the form of bread and wine," with the further explanations of Dr. Pusey and the much-venerated author of the "Christian Year." These divines distinctly advocate the "co-existent" theory

ⁿ Dr. Pusey has publicly stated that the words "commonly called" were inserted by himself, expressly to lessen the force of the protest against the Romish definition. By others it is argued that our Articles are not levelled at the true doctrine of that Church, but at "certain carnal notions current in the sixteenth century which were very considerably rectified by the Council of Trent."—"Church and World," p. 207.) One writer at last boldly asserts that there is *no difference* between the teaching of the Church of Rome and the Objective Presence of the new school.—("Kiss of Peace.")

• This word 'co-existence' is used and defended by both. In *Euch. Ador.*, p. 145, the author avows his agreement with the doctrine of the Confession of Augsburg—the true "Protestant" Confession, and contends that it is not untenable in the Church of England.

invented by Martin Luther, while agreeing with his followers in disclaiming the word *Consubstantiation*. They interpret the Body and Blood of the Eucharist of the Glorified Humanity, and so of the whole Person of Christ. They call this the "inward part," and the bread and wine the "outward part" of the sacrament, holding the two to be inseparably united by consecration, each however retaining its proper substance and nature. This is pure Lutheranism, the difference being that Luther limited the Presence to the act of communion, and held it to be absolutely inconsistent with sacrifice; whence his theory was felt to be practically not irreconcilable with Zwingli himself.^p The Objectivists, on the other hand, insisting on consecration and oblation, more than communion, refine away the material element into a "vessel," a "garment or veil;" leaving little difference from the Romish "accidents," and resulting in a sacrifice almost exactly the same as the Mass.

The new school defend the corporal formula from the authority of the First Book of Homilies (A.D. 1547), or rather of a printer's notice at the end, that—

"hereafter shall follow sermons . . . of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, under the form of bread and wine."

But besides the doubtful authority of such a notice, (ending with the loyal formula, "God save the King,") it is the Homilies themselves, or rather "their godly and wholesome doctrine," which the Church accepts

^p Bishop Jewell thought it probable they would unite, on further mutual explanation. (Apol. Eccl. Ang.)

in the Thirty-five Articles. No Homily contains these words. The sermon promised in the notice is entitled, "A Homily on the Worthy Receiving and Reverent Esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." This is the title given in the Article; and it would be truer to say that the formula was advisedly *rejected* by the Church of England. When Gardiner hazarded a similar assertion of the Prayer-book, Cranmer replied, with the Macedonian simplicity of the times, that it was "a plain untruth."

The address to the archbishop seeks to support the phrase from the word "form" in the Catechism; but in the first place, this word is *not* applied in the Catechism to the Eucharist, but to Baptism only; and in the next, if "form" be equivalent to "outward part or sign," the meaning is given in the previous definition of a sacrament, "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace *given unto us*." The "grace" is given to *us*, not to the sacrament; given and received, as Cosin says, "semel et simul," but not therefore physically enclosed in, or united to, the sign by which it is given. It is not said (as these writers would have it), "a sign *and* a grace," but, "the sign of a grace given" to the receiver. The grace is "inward and spiritual" *to him*, not to the material sign, which is not capable of it. The "sign or form" in Baptism is water and the action of baptizing, "outward and visible" to the baptized person; the grace is "a death unto sin," &c., "inward and spiritual," not to the sign but to the receiver. In like manner the "outward part or sign" in the other sacrament is not the "*form*," but the whole substances of bread and

wine, with the same condition of being duly received ; and "the inward part or thing signified" must be a grace given to the receiver, signified by the sign, but inward and spiritual to the communicant. This grace is the "Body and Blood of Christ," because these are "verily and indeed given and received in the sacrament;" but *in* is not *inside*¹, nor does "part" imply a physical union of two substances. The "spiritual part" of a sacrament, in the language of the Catechism and of the Fathers, is its spiritual power or quality; as in logic, the "formal part," or *difference*, is that which distinguishes one individual from another of the same *genus*, or "material part". All this has been already discussed in the chapters devoted to the Tridentine and Lutheran hypotheses, and there is nothing new in these halting expressions, beyond their ambiguity.

Of Transubstantiation, Archdeacon Wilberforce has well observed,—

"First, that the consecrated elements, even if they undergo a material change, have no more tendency than without such change to produce the real ends which result from sacraments; and secondly, that to rest on such a change is

¹ According to Bp. Andrewes, *in, cum, sub, per, &c.*, are matters of opinion, not of faith: the fact, not the mode, constitutes the Real Presence of Catholic teaching.

² "*Genus est quod prædicatur de pluribus ut eorum essentia pars materialis sive communis. Differentia quæ ut essentia pars formalis sive discretiva.*"—Aldrich, *Artis Logicæ Rudimenta*. This venerable instructor of our youth does not teach that *animal* and *rationale* are two substantive "co-existences" constituting *homo*; but that the power of reasoning is the distinguishing quality of the animal *man*.

incompatible with a reference to our Lord's *ascended* Manhood, as that Head of the renewed race, with whom it is the purpose of sacraments to unite us. . . . A spiritual efficacy indeed our Lord's Body has on all those with whom, *according to its proper laws of action*, it is brought into connexion, *but would this action attend its material consumption?* Is there any relevance between union with the Flesh of the Son of Man and the carnal devouring Him? We are united to Adam by one means; to Christ by another. The first is by the law of paternity; the second by that of regeneration. Why should we increase our relation to Christ by this carnal banquet, any more than we should to Adam by the eating of his flesh? . . . A spiritual effect of the Manhood of our Great Head *must proceed through spiritual action from His purified Humanity*."

Now the "ascended Humanity" being indisputably in heaven, the argument is equally cogent against every form of material contact,—i.e. every hypothesis which would lodge the thing signified in the matter of the sacramental elements. Such a Presence effects *nothing* towards the object in view, while it is inconsistent with the true action of our Lord's Manhood in heaven; to which our Church has added, as the result of a sad experience, "it hath given occasion to many superstitions[†]."

It is remarkable that this Paper contains no allusion to *participation*, which is, after all, the proper use of the sacrament, and in which *alone* the Anglican formularies assert the Real Presence. The Catechism affirms that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed *taken and received* by the faithful in the

[†] "Incarnation," p. 428.

[†] Art. XXVIII.

Lord's Supper; but it maintains a significant silence on His Presence in the elements by consecration, apart from reception, as asserted by the Tridentine and Lutheran definitions. Hooker says, "The bread and the cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His Body and Blood ensueth^u." As far as was known to this great divine, there are but three expositions of the Real Presence,—the Lutheran, the Tridentine, and that of the Church of England. The former two define "what the sacrament is *in itself and before participation*;" the last asserts only "what it is unto faithful receivers;" this he affirms to

"have in it nothing but what all the rest do approve and acknowledge to be most true, nothing but that which the words of Christ are on all sides confessed to enforce, nothing but that which the Church of God hath always thought necessary, nothing but that which alone is sufficient for every Christian man to believe, concerning the use and force of this sacrament, finally nothing but that wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant, and all Christian confessions agreeable^x."

In the Fathers it is certain that *all* which is taught of the sacramental Presence has relation to the act of communion; and no passage can be produced from Scripture, or any "godly doctor of the most pure and uncorrupt ages," in which any Presence is asserted irrespective of participation. Yet this essential condition is wholly absent from the enunciations of the "Objective" Presence. Is it probable that a *fourth*

^u Eccl. Pol., v. lxvii. 5.

^x Ibid., lxviii. 12.

interpretation, unknown to Hooker, has been discovered? or must these writers be supposed to imply a condition which they have omitted to express? Those who choose to speak where the Church is silent, and keep silence where the Church has unequivocally pronounced, are not entitled to complain if they are suspected of disloyalty. It is their own fault if their Objective Presence is classed in the corporal rather than the spiritual category.

The ambiguity thus cast over the article of the Presence, will be found to envelope all that is inferred from it. The address to the Archbishop proceeds to say,—

“We repudiate the notion of any fresh sacrifice, or any view of the Eucharistic sacrificial offering as of something apart from the one all-sufficient sacrifice and oblation on the cross, which alone ‘is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual,’ and which alone is ‘meritorious.’

“We believe that as in heaven Christ our great High-Priest ever offers Himself before the eternal Father, pleading by His Presence His sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross; so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood, once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself when He instituted the blessed sacrament of His Body and Blood.”

This, again, is perfectly Catholic, if Body and Blood are understood in the true sense of the words, and “sacramentally present” mean present by a sacrament

and in grace⁷. But it is not so in the Tridentine or Lutheran explanation of the words. If the elements be allowed to retain their natural substance, the sacrifice can be only mystical and representative. A *compound* oblation of the living Christ and inanimate matter is what no theology admits. The Romanists abolish the elements, and the Lutherans abolish the sacrifice. A united sacrifice of both was always seen to be impossible. The escape from this dilemma, devised by a writer venerated for sacred poetry throughout the Anglican communion, exhibits a devout imagination rather than a sound theology :—

“The true oblation in the Eucharist is not the bread and wine, that is only the vessel which contains, or the garment which veils it; . . . but that which our Lord, by the hands of the priest, offers to His Father in the Holy Eucharist is His own Body and Blood, the very same which He offers and presents to Him, with which, as S. Paul says⁸, He appears before Him *now*, night and day continually in heaven, in commemoration of His having offered it once for all in His Passion and death on the cross. It is the one great reality, summing up in itself all the memorial sacrifices of the law.”

This comes as near as possible to the annihilation of the elements, and it is instructive to find a distinction which Waterland employed against material sacrifice,

⁷ Yet this is what is eagerly denied by less-instructed penmen. Archdeacon Freeman's opportune re-assertion of the true *res sacramenti*, has been insolently characterized as his own invention; and critics, who ought to know better, still decry it as Nestorianism. When clergymen talk so, one ceases to wonder at the rant of a lay-journalist: “There is but one offering for sin, the Mass, as there is but one God.”—*Church Times*, July 30, 1869.

⁸ Heb. ix. 24.

reproduced in the endeavour to approximate to the Mass. In point of fact, the oblation of the bread and wine is the most dwelt upon by the earliest Fathers. To this were referred the type of Melchisedek, and the prophecy of Malachi: the representation of Christ's death, always understood in it, was not so prominently brought out till the time of S. Cyprian^a. At no time is the peculiar view of this passage to be found in any recognised teaching. That Christ's living Person in heaven is the "memorial" of His sacrifice on the cross; and that the Blood referred to in Heb. ix. 12, is living Blood now flowing in His veins, are propositions for which the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Schoolmen will be ransacked in vain. They belong to the field of imagination: yet they are now seriously offered as the very basis of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Mr. Keble says:—

"The Eucharist, as the Fathers speak, is the unbloody sacrifice of the New Testament, unbloody, though it be in part an offering of blood, *ἀναιμακτὸς*, not *ἀναιμος*. No blood shed in it, but the living Blood of Christ with His living Body offered up to the Father for a memorial of the real blood-shedding, the awful and painful sacrifice of the cross. This memorial Christ offers in heaven, night and day, to God the Father: His glorified Body with all its wounds, His Blood which He poured out on the cross, *but on His resurrection took again to Himself*, and with it ascended into heaven. With that Body and Blood He appears continually before the throne, by it making intercession for us, by it reminding God the Father of His one oblation of Himself once offered on the cross; as S. John writes, 'We have an advocate'—one to plead for us—'with the Father, and He is the

^a See *infra*, chap. xi.

propitiation for our sins.' Thus He is our Aaron first, and then our Melchisedek, the virtue of His perpetual advocacy depending on His former propitiation. Both ways He is 'a Priest for ever^b.'

The confusion of thought and figure exhibited in these passages is really surprising. Waiving the Greek criticism, which might be more convincing from a Greek father, we may ask, what Evangelist or Apostle has recorded the *fact* that Jesus Christ "took again to Himself at His resurrection the Blood which He poured out on the cross?" If the old question of Blood in the risen Saviour's Body is now to be decided against the Apostle and S. Augustine, it would be easier to suppose a reproduction, through the restoration of the vital action, than a re-insertion of cold unfluid particles from without. Such seems to have been Jeremy Taylor's idea^c; but he was far from confounding this conjecture with the true Blood of the cross and the Eucharist, of which "He reserved nothing^d." Unless we admit a new and supposititious miracle, this whole

^b Euch. Ador., p. 67.

^c "All His Blood did stream over us until He made the fountain dry, and reserved nothing of that by which He knew His Church was to live, and move, and have her being. Thus the stream of Blood issued out to become a fountain for the sacrament of the chalice, and water gushed out to fill the founts of baptism and repentance."—*Great Exemplar*, Part iii. *Considerations upon the Accidents after His Death*.

^d "The soul of Jesus returned from Paradise and the visitation of separate spirits, and re-entered into His holy Body, which He by His Divine power did redintegrate, filling His veins with blood, healing all the wounds excepting those five of His hands, feet, and side, which He reserved as trophies of His victory and argument of His Passion."—*Ibid*. The Bishop could hardly have meant that these five were literally kept as "wounds" (open), or the blood must perpetually escape.

theory of the "memorial" falls to the ground; and even allowing this novel wonder, it derives no sanction from S. Paul or S. John. It is not of living blood in the veins of a living body, but of blood dead, blood separate from the flesh, that the Apostle writes to the Hebrews. In the symbolism of the Law, the blood was the liturgical evidence of the victim's death. It was presented within the veil in token of the death of the sin-offering without. Whence the Apostle writes, that Christ is gone into heaven, not *with* Blood in His veins, but *by*, or in virtue of (*διὰ*), the Blood shed upon the cross, i.e. to present the sacrifice there made once for all. He expressly adds, "*not* that He should offer Himself often," but that He should there "appear" in the power of the one offering of His death. S. John also rests His perpetual advocacy on the same propitiation of the cross. Though he saw in heaven "a Lamb as it had been slain," he mentions no blood in it. Rather, if the wounds by which the Blood escaped were still seen (which S. John does not say), the vision would seem to indicate its continued absence; for otherwise, would not the wounds be healed?

It is not on conceits of this kind that the sacred writers or the Catholic Fathers rest the Eucharistic sacrifice. Neither do they sanction either of the "two ways" in which Christ is here imagined to be "a Priest for ever." These words are cited by the Apostle to *exclude* the priesthood of Aaron; that Jesus ever was or could be a priest after that order is what he emphatically denies. The cross was not a Levitical altar, nor its sacrifice a Levitical offering; it was the unique self-oblation of the true Son in right of the eternal

Priesthood, of which the sons of Aaron were but a partial and transitory shadow. An Aaronical character might indeed attach to such a memorial as Mr. Keble supposes Him to offer in quality of our Melchisedek. The Fathers, who connected the priesthood of Melchisedek with the Eucharistic sacrifice, found the anti-type in the memorial of bread and wine celebrated in the Church below. When they spoke of Christ offering it above, they meant that He there presents the worship of His Church. Beyond this, His Melchisedekian Priesthood signified with them, as with the Apostle, only intercession and benediction.

Another way in which Christ has been said to offer in heaven, is by there pleading the sacrifice once made for all upon the cross; but this is very different from making His living Person a "memorial" of His past death, in order to identify it with the memorial of the Eucharist. The death itself is always before God in heaven; the Eucharist is its memorial on earth, celebrated in the appointed symbols of bread and wine. That Christ offers His living Person as a memorial of His Passion, is an incongruous notion, unknown to the divinity either of Rome or England. The extracts in our last chapter shew no trace of it. It is equally absent from the citations of Dr. Pusey, in his "Letter to the Bishop of London," 1851. Most of these have been given in our last chapter*.

Dr. Pusey then wrote :—

"I believe that He who did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of His

* Pp. 180—197.

precious death until His coming again, does look graciously upon, and present in heaven, the memorial which we make upon earth, . . . in His abiding Priesthood, after the order of Melchisedek, He pleads in heaven what He has commanded us to plead on earth. . . . In Field's words, paraphrasing the ancient prayer: 'We offer to Thy view and set before Thine eyes the crucified Body of Christ Thy Son, which is here present in mystery and sacrament, and the Blood which He once shed for our sakes, which we know to be that pure, holy, undefiled, and eternal sacrifice, wherewith only Thou art pleased; desiring Thee to be merciful unto us for the merit and worthiness thereof, and so to look upon the same sacrifice, which representatively we offer to Thy view, as to accept it for a full discharge of us from our sins, and a perfect propitiation, that so Thou mayest behold us with a pleased, cheerful, and gracious countenance^f.'"

Again:—

"Our ever-blessed Lord unceasingly presents in heaven that sacrifice which He once offered on the cross."

It is added, with much earnestness,—

"This is the only doctrine which I ever meant in any of my books to teach. . . . But while I say this is the only doctrine, I do not mean it as lowering that doctrine, but this only, that the sacrifice and oblation in the Eucharist has its efficacy only by pleading and applying the one sacrifice of the cross."—(p. 50.)

In all this there is no allusion to the doctrine of Christ offering His living Person in heaven as the memorial of His death, and the Church offering the same memorial in the Eucharistic sacrifice. Further, it must be observed that in this Letter the words

^f Letter, pp. 35, 36.

"Objective Presence" are also not to be found, though ventilated, as we have seen, by Archdeacon Wilberforce three years before. Here, then, we have the actual date of the theory so rapidly developed.

A "term of modern philosophy," not rightly understood, was introduced, to limit the Real Presence to a narrow and questionable explanation. Then new meanings were sought from the Lutheran and Tridentine Confessions, supplemented by private theory and conjecture. The Fathers are still vaguely appealed to, but the original deference to the divines of our own Church has been replaced by an increasing contempt of "mere Anglicanism," and a marked impatience of its ritual. In the midst of so much private judgment, it is still hard to find a certain definition of the Objective Presence. Some have undoubtedly accepted it only as equivalent to the real spiritual Presence of our older writers^a. Others have (perhaps unwarily) been led into the doctrine of Trent; while the explanation of at least one much-trusted exponent proves to be neither Anglican, Roman, nor Lutheran, but a new combination of the co-existent Presence with the Tridentine sacrifice, under a novel interpretation of each^b.

^a So, doubtless, the present Bishop of Salisbury in his Bampton Lectures, 1868; for in the second edition the word is withdrawn, with the explanation, "I have omitted the word Objective, which in the first edition stood in this place, on the ground that whether the grace of the Holy Eucharist come to our souls by and through the elements, or no, alike it is 'objective' as coming to us from without ourselves, and having existence independently of our own thoughts. Every body holds the Presence to be 'objective,' except the merest Zwinglian."

^b The biographer of Bishop Patteson records (apparently with regret)

The Ritual acts introduced for the expression of the new tenet are of the same varying and eclectic character: much is simply imitated from the Roman Mass, with hardly a semblance of really Catholic authority. Even the acknowledged innovation of substituting adoration for communion is revived. Persons imagine that they "assist at the sacrifice," by remaining on their knees during the communion, without obeying the Divine injunction to eat and drink. When such things are defended on the nature of the Presence, they supply the most conclusive proof of the uncatholic character of the doctrine; since it is certain these were not usages of the undivided Church. That Christ is to be adored wherever He is, is a mere truism in Christianity; but when His Presence is in-

that "in spite of his deep veneration for Mr. Keble and his teachings, he did not embrace to the full the doctrine maintained in '*Eucharistic Adoration*,' and which he rightly perceived to lie at the root of the whole *Ritualistic question*. His conclusions had been formed on the teachings of the elder Anglican Divines."—*Miss Yonge's Life*, vol. i. p. 141. In a Letter to Dr. Moberly, the Bishop asks if "there is not a mode of speaking and writing on the Holy Eucharist, prevalent among some men now, which has no parallel in the Church of England, except it may be in some of the non-jurors." He adds, "it is oftentimes a sad grief to me, that I cannot accept some of the reasonings and opinions of dear Mr. Keble in his book on '*Eucharistic Adoration*.' . . . There is something about the book which may be quite right and true, but does not to me quite savour of the healthy, sound theology of the Church of England: the fragrance is rather that of an exotic plant."—(*Ibid.*, pp. 256, 7.) Such expressions, wrung from a loving and thoroughly Catholic-minded friend, may be allowed to acquit the criticism here submitted of any thought of disrespect to the author of the "*Christian Year*." No one acquainted with the laws of thought can fail to perceive that his publication is as wanting in sound reasoning as it is fertile in pious and elevated imagination.

ferred from the Presence of His Body and Blood in the Eucharistic symbols, it is obvious to reply that "Body and Blood" are not co-extensive terms with His whole human nature; and further, that no such worship was practised in the early Church. Nothing is read of "Eucharistic adoration" in the purest ages, beyond receiving the elements in a posture of reverence scarcely equal to our own order of kneeling¹. It is certain that every one worshipped Christ present in the mysteries, and further, that every one (not under censure) was expected to partake of the Communion in both kinds. These are Catholic verities that cannot be impugned. Non-communicating attendance and adoration of the symbols, or of Christ in the symbols, are abuses rejected by all our Divines, as opposed to the very nature of the Sacrament.

The tenet of transubstantiation seems to have been elaborated mainly to escape the charge of idolatry in adoring the host. The Roman Divines are careful to explain, that they do not worship one object in union with another which is not worshipped, but that, while the substance of the bread and wine is annihilated, the visible species are included in the adoration, as one *compositum* with the Body and Blood of Christ. They perceive the impossibility of adoring Christ in the Sacrament, without adoring the Sacrament at the same time. This delusion with respect to the nature of the object, perhaps, withheld the Church of England from formally extending the charge of idolatry

¹ Mr. Keble seems to admit that no other external marks of adoration are necessary, but why, then, are they practised and defended?

to the adoration of the host : but Rome herself would admit the charge, if she could be convinced that the host were composed of *two* substances,—bread and Body.

What the Church of England holds, is shewn by the prohibition of elevation in the First Book of Edward VI.,—by the direction to say the prayer of consecration *standing* throughout, omitting the acts of adoration previously practised,—and by the anxiety evinced in the Declaration at the end of the Office, lest the kneeling at reception should be “misconstrued and depraved.” These words, read in their natural construction, plainly exclude any other act of homage than kneeling at reception ; and of this it is declared that, “no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, (neither in intent or deed,) either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto *any* corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood.” The first, because it is idolatry ; the second, because they “are in heaven, and *not here*.”

Hooker observes that it is only “some *personal* divine excellency” that warrants adoration ; and S. Augustine explains how the Person of the Son of God, being incarnate in His glorified Body, includes the Humanity in the adoration properly due to Himself. His human nature, however exalted in heaven, is still created, and therefore in itself not an object of worship : it becomes so by hypostatic union with God the Word. Now the Word is not hypostatically united to the sacramental bread and wine. The Body wherein He is tabernacled is “in heaven, and not here ;” consequently to that Body in heaven, not

to any other spot in created space, the adoration of Christ is to be directed^k.

The Fathers, like our own Church, insist on Christ's Body being necessarily circumscribed within a certain place, and the impossibility of its being in two places at once. To say that His human nature is in the paten and the chalice, is to assign it another place than heaven: or to say that Christ Himself is there to be adored, is to assign Him another temple than His glorified Body. All attempts to escape this dilemma result in affirming and contradicting with the same breath.

"Local, not local," says Bishop Bilson, "corporal, not corporal, be plain contradictions, and by no means incident to the natural Flesh of Christ. One it must needs be; both it cannot be, though you sweat out your hearts with wrangling."

To the Romanist in his dialogue, complaining of misconception, and saying,—

"We adore Christ, the Son of the Living God, and Second Person in the Trinity, in those mysteries, as S. Ambrose saith, or as we speak more usually, under those forms of Bread and Wine;"

the Catholic answers:—

"I mistake you not. I know you adore that which is locally and really enclosed within the compass of your host and chalice, supposing it in matter and substance to be the glorious Body of Christ: but your foundation

^k See this historically established in Archd. Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service."

we say is false, and therefore your building must needs be ruinous. Christ is present in the mysteries, not by the material substance of His Body, closed within the forms of bread and wine, but by a divine and spiritual virtue and effieience;—not mixing His substance with the elements, but entering the hearts of the faithful, and nourishing them with His Spirit and Grace to eternal life, the elements abiding in their proper and former essence and substance.”

Bishop Andrewes, who is often cited by the Objective school, carefully distinguishes the “veneration” due to the symbols from the divine adoration belonging to Christ¹. He argues against adoring the host from the admission of Roman divines, that though transubstantiation is the doctrine of the Church, they can never be certain it is effected in a particular host. But it is the particular host which is elevated for adoration, and if transubstantiation cannot be certain, the people may be worshipping simple bread, which is little short of idolatry^m.

Affirming that “no Christian man will ever refuse to do what Augustine says, that is, to adore the Flesh of Christ;” he protests against the Romish interpolation *sous les espèces*, “under the forms” of Bread and Wine, as a thing unheard-of till long after Augustineⁿ. Further, he censures Bellarmine’s expression of adoring “Christ in the Sacrament”—the very language of our Objective school—as “a shameful stumble on the threshold:”—

¹ Answer to Perron’s Reply.

^m Ad Ap. Bell. Resp., cap. i.

ⁿ Answer to Perron’s Reply.

"Truly" (he says) "Christ Himself, the *res sacramenti*, both in and with the sacrament, out of and without the sacrament,—*ubi, ubi est*,—is to be adored. And we also, with Ambrose, 'adore the Flesh of Christ in the mysteries.' Yet not that thing (*id*), but Him (*eum*), who above (not *upon*) the altar is worshipped*."

The meaning of this great divine cannot be doubted; for, when distinguishing (as we saw before) between the glorified and the crucified Body, he says:—

"We are in this action not only *carried up to Christ* (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ in the act of His offering."

The *sursum corda* plainly denotes the *place* of the Object of adoration.

According to Jeremy Taylor,—

"We may not worship Christ's Human Nature present in the Sacrament without peril of idolatry, because His Human Nature is *not there*, and to worship it would be to worship a *Non ens*, which is the Apostle's definition of idolatry."

Johnson, too, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice," observes with truth,—

"That the ancients never supposed the Divine Nature either of Christ or the Holy Ghost to be hypostatically united to the bread and wine, so as to entitle them to the worship due to the Manhood of Jesus."

* Resp. ad Bell. The genuflexions with which Andrewes approached the altar, when the sacrament was *not* upon it, shew the kind of veneration which he observed.

In short, there is no Anglican teaching, of any school, that does not protest against the kind of Eucharistic Adoration founded on the "Objective Presence," and consequently none would accept the new teaching as a true or permissible view of the Real Spiritual Presence. It is an *eclectic*, not a Catholic, dogma. It represents no one Church, ancient or modern; no Liturgy or Council, nor, in spite of the vague appeal to antiquity, a single Father of the undivided Church, supports the conception that Christ's living Person is offered in the bread or wine as in a vessel or veil. All are unanimous that the oblation of His Body and Blood in the sacrament, is a symbolical and representative^p offering of His slain Body and outshed Blood upon the cross; that is, of His death, the one sacrifice for sins for ever. To their evidence we now proceed.

^p A fashion has been introduced of writing "re-present" as if it meant presenting over again, but this is a fiction.

CHAPTER IX.

COUNCILS AND LITURGIES.

IN inquiring into the doctrine of the Catholic Church before the separation of East and West, it must be borne in mind that there were then no formulated systems of divinity, such as grew out of the controversies of later periods. Holy Scripture was the rule of faith, and the Creeds were the Confessions, of Catholic antiquity. The only other authentic standards were the Canons and Liturgies; both intended as rules of discipline rather than doctrine, yet indirectly affording clear evidence of the faith on which all Christian discipline depends.

Canons^a are not required till some error or question supervenes; and as little difference existed about the Eucharist, the Canons relating to it are few, though significant. One of the earliest is as follows:—

“If any bishop or presbyter, against the Lord’s ordinance in respect to the Sacrifice, shall offer upon the altar any other things, either honey, or milk, or a factitious liquor or confection in place of wine, or birds, or any living creature, or pulse, let him be deposed as acting against the Lord’s ordinance^b.”

^a The name was first given to synodical provisions by the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341.

^b Ap. Can. iii. App. No. 1. The exact date of this canon is unknown, but it is probably not later than the third century. Bishop Hefele considers that these details are mentioned to combat some heretical

The Greek collection of the Apostolical Canons contains eighty-five canons, all of which were accepted as of apostolic origin by the Greek Œcumenical Council in Trullo, A.D. 692. The Latin text of Dionysius the Less has only the first fifty. They were rejected as apocryphal either by Pope Gelasius, A.D. 494, or (as Hefele thinks) by Hormisdas, a few years later. They have been received notwithstanding into the Canon Law, and are held orthodox throughout the Roman obedience. Bp. Beveridge shews that these canons are the decrees of the synods held in the second and third centuries; and some attempt has been lately made to find their several dates by Dr. von Drey, whom Hefele pronounces to be the best authority on the subject.

The African Church allowed milk and honey to be set on the altar on a particular day, supposed to have been used in the baptism of infants^c. But the Eucharistic oblation consisted only of the proper gifts, the bread and wine which represented the Great Sacrifice, and were consumed in the rite itself. These are called the sacrifice and the oblation, and the officiating minister is said to "offer" them. Thus the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314) decreed that—

"Such Presbyters as sacrificed (to idols during the persecution), but afterwards returned to the good fight, not in pretence but in truth, not having previously arranged and managed (with the tormentors) that they may appear to submit to tortures which were not really inflicted, that these should continue to enjoy the privilege of sitting (with

customs. (Hefele's "History of the Councils," Clark's Translation, p. 459.)

^c Conc. Cart., III. can. xxiv. App. No. 1.

the bishop in the *bema*), but not be allowed to offer or preach, or minister in any priestly function, (*προσφέρειν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἢ ὁμιλεῖν ἢ ὅλως λειτουργεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν μὴ ἐξεῖναι*^d).

The faithful—i.e. all admitted to communion—are forbidden to leave the church without communicating^e. A clergyman present at the oblation and not receiving, is commanded to give his reason for such a scandalous reflection on the celebrant^f.

Deacons were not to give the Body to priests, but receive in their order after them, and assist in the ministration. Bishops and priests alone may offer, and they not in private houses^g.

Penitents were excluded for various periods, according to their sin, before being "perfected," or restored to communion^h. No one, however, at the point of death was to be refused the *viaticum*ⁱ.

Such were the rules of universal obligation down to the middle of the fifth century. Throughout this period the terms *sacrifice* and *oblation* are used both of the whole rite and of the material symbols. The elements after consecration are called the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Holy Table the altar. The phrase "Divine or Holy Table" is sometimes used metaphorically for the entire rite, as "sacrament" is among ourselves. Thus in the Acts of the First

^d Conc. Ançyra, can. i. The verb "sacrifice" (*θύω*) is generally used, as in this canon, of heathen sacrifices; but the substantive, *θύσια*, as well as *προσφορά*, is applied to the Eucharist. (See the previous Apostolical Canon.)

^e Ap. Can. x. (ix.) Ant. ii. App. No. 1.

^f Ap. Can. ix. (viii.) App. No. 1.

^g Nic. Can. xviii.; Laod. lviii.

^h Nic. Can. xi. App. No. 1.

ⁱ Nic. Can. xiii. App. No. 1.

General Council (A.D. 325) the heading "of the Divine Table and the mystery there present of the Body and Blood of Christ," may be interpreted either of the *banquet* or the *altar*. The Council says:—

"Also in (or on) the Divine Table let us not meanly fix our intent on the bread exhibited and the cup, but, lifting up the mind in faith, let us understand in that Holy Table the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world *unsacrificially sacrificed* (*ἀθύτως θυόμενον*) by the priests, and, really receiving His precious Body and Blood, believe them to be symbols of our resurrection. Therefore also we receive, not much but a little, that we may know it to be taken not for satiety, but for sanctification ^k."

In this passage, the remarkable expression, *ἀθύτως θυόμενον*, seems equivalent to the common appellation "unbloody sacrifice." While shewing the universal recognition of the Christian rite as a sacrifice, it no less clearly distinguishes it, both from the animal sacrifices of the law, and the great sacrifice of the cross.

The Quinisext canons, which the Greeks account œcumenical (A.D. 692), sanction the appellation, "unbloody sacrifice^l." They prohibit, as an innovation of the Armenians contrary to the ancient Liturgies, the use of wine unmixed with water^m, and command the elements to be received in the hand, not in a spoon or other receptacleⁿ.

These canons bring us to the close of the seventh century: down to this time there is no allusion to

^k Act. Con. Nic. ii. 30, p. 427; apud Act. Concil. Paris, 1715. App. No. 1.

^l Conc. Trull., can. xxviii. App. No. 1.

^m Ibid., xxxii. App. No. 1.

ⁿ Ibid., ei.

reservation, except for immediate communion to the sick, or others necessarily absent. This was simply an enlargement of the Communion, without prejudice to the consumption of the elements at each celebration. The well-known story of the sacrament being conveyed to Serapion by the hands of a child does not at all imply reservation. The priest, though unable to travel, might consecrate the Eucharist for the purpose°. The frequency of celebrations in that age, both public and private, would render reservation unnecessary.

The penitential rules shew the strictness of the altar discipline, though it was necessarily exposed to a struggle with continually increasing difficulties, as the Church extended itself among an imperfectly converted population. Catechumens not baptized, and others not yet admitted to communicate, were dismissed after the sermon and before the offertory. They were followed by those under penance, the term of which extended from three to twelve years, unless dispensed with by the bishop. When these were gone, notice was given by the deacon that none were to remain unless in charity and without hypocrisy, and the doors were closed. The faithful then proceeded to make their oblations, and receive the communion.

It has been questioned whether *all* who remained were required to receive, but the provisions are too clear to

° Eus. E. H., vi. 44. The peculiarity is, that the sacrament was intrusted to a child, instead of a deacon, as in Justin Martyr's account, (see the next chapter). Valerius, in his note on the passage, observes, that this irregularity was forbidden by Ratherius, bishop of Verona (in the tenth century).

be gainsaid. Communion being the sole end and object of the institution, no other rule would at first be required. The testimony of Justin Martyr is conclusive on the practice; and nothing appears to raise a question till the opening of the third century, when some of the Alexandrian clergy are said to have left it to the conscience of the attendants to partake or to forbear^p. At a later time, however, the Council of Elvira (A.D. 305) prohibited non-communicants from contributing to the offertory^q; and as this was always a part of the oblation, they must have retired with the penitents before it commenced. Another canon of the same Council suspends from Communion all who absent themselves from church for three Sundays. This is recognised as the ancient law of the Church by the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347), and confirmed by the Greek Œcumenical Council in Trullo (A.D. 692). One of the Apostolical Canons excommunicates those who come to the Lessons and do not remain to the "Prayers" (of the faithful) and Holy Communion; a penalty renewed by the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341) in the following terms:—

"That all who come into the Church of God, and hear the holy Scriptures, but do not communicate in prayer with the people, or turn away from the holy partaking of the Eucharist in any disorderly way, be cast out of the church until, after

^p "Some, after the customary division of the elements, leave it upon the consciences of their people either to take their part or otherwise; for the best rule to determine them is their own conscience."—*Clem. Alex. Strom.*, i. 1. (Waterland, Review, c. xiv.)

^q Conc. Elib., can. xxviii.: "Episcopum placuit ab eo qui non communicat munus accipere non debere."

confessing and giving proof of their repentance, they shall, on their entreaty, be admitted to reconciliation[†]."

The strictness of this regulation is complained of by Balsamon (who was patriarch of Antioch at the end of the twelfth century); both he and the earlier Greek canonist Zonaras acknowledging, that it exacted actual Communion from all present, even though unwilling[‡]. To mitigate the severity of these canons, it has been suggested that they were levelled at particular dissentients, who disturbed the order of the Church; and that where there was no ἀταξία, Communion might be forborne from conscientious motives without offence. This is a reason for retiring without censure, not for remaining while others were receiving, than which there could be hardly any greater ἀταξία. Such persons would certainly withdraw, in obedience to the deacon's notification, before the offertory; they could have no motive for remaining, if they were neither to offer nor to receive.

The case of the highest class of penitents (called *consistentes*) has also been adduced as an example of non-communicating attendance. These were permitted to stand among the faithful in the church, and "without the oblation, to communicate with the people in

[†] Ant., can. ii. App. No. 1.

[‡] Zonaras:—"Canon, exigit omnes dum sanctum celebrabatur Sacrificium ad finem usque in oratione sanctaque Communionem perseverare. Siquidem tunc temporis a laicis exigebatur, ut frequenter communicarent."

Balsamon:—"Segregat enim eos, qui in ecclesiam conveniunt et non ad finem usque expectant et communicant." . . . He adds that, in his own time, some, relying on this canon, insisted that all who came into the church were obliged to take the Sacrament, "etiam invitos." (Howell's Synopsis, in Ap. Can. ix.)

the prayers^t," words supposed to mean that they remained throughout the Communion without receiving the sacrament^u. If this were really so, it would be far from a precedent for that voluntary non-communicating attendance which is now claimed as the right and privilege of the laity^x. On the contrary, it would be just one of those exceptions which most forcibly prove the rule. If these penitents were distinguished from the others by not communicating, it is plain that all who were admissible did actually communicate: otherwise, the exclusion would have been no censure.

It is much to be doubted, however, whether the *consistentes* did, in fact, remain throughout the Communion. The modern notion of assisting at the sacrifice, by adoring without receiving the sacrament, was then wholly unheard-of. There was no object in remaining, but to communicate; and if this were not permitted, why should any one remain? The punishment of actually seeing others enjoy a privilege denied to themselves, would be no compensation for so great an invasion of the Communion of the faithful. We cannot imagine the early Church choosing to offer the sacri-

^t Χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν.—*Conc. Nic.*, can. xi.

^u Waterland's Review, ch. xiv. p. 375. Balsamon, however, is clear the canon was intended to disallow any excuses of piety or humility.

^x See Mr. Scudamore's "Communion of the Laity," where this claim is fully and learnedly determined. In answer to the modern distinction of the sacrifice from the sacrament he observes, that it was from the "sacrifice" (προσφορὰ) that the *consistentes* were in terms excluded. This is strong proof that no one was then thought to assist in the sacrifice who did not receive the sacrament.

fice of Christ's mystical Body in such a visible separation of the members. The very idea of the rite necessitates the retirement of all who are unfit to perform it, and this appears to be the true account of the matter. Justin Martyr notes a division in the service, marked by the kiss of peace: "Having ended the prayers, and saluted one another with a kiss, there is *then* brought in bread and a cup," &c., and the proper Communion Service follows. These prayers answer to the *pro-anaphora* or *ante-oblatory* part of the Liturgies, between which and the *anaphora* the kiss of peace is still retained. The same division is referred to in one of the Laodicean canons (A.D. 312—372):—

"After the bishop's sermon, the prayer of the catechumens shall first be offered, and after they are gone the prayer of those in penance; and when these have come under the bishop's hand and withdrawn, then the three prayers of the faithful are to be made; the first in silence, the second and third at the bidding (of the deacon). Then the (kiss of) peace is to be given, the priest to give to the bishop the peace, and the laity to give the peace (to each other). After this, the oblation is to be celebrated, the clergy only being permitted to enter in to the altar to take the communion &c."

This is exactly the order of the earliest extant Liturgy. After the kiss of peace, and before the offertory, the deacon cries, "Ye that have prayed the former prayer depart." Then the doors are closed, and the *anaphora* (including offertory, consecration, and communion) proceeds. This "former prayer" is the same

† Conc. Laod., can. xix. App. No. 1.

with the "prayers of the faithful" in the canon. In these, and perhaps in the kiss of peace, the *consistentes* were allowed to participate, and then, "having come under the bishop's hand," they withdrew before the doors were shut, "without the oblation," i.e. not remaining to the *anaphora*¹.

This will be found the most consistent view of the early provisions, and it is in no wise opposed to the Alexandrian practice of advising those, whose conscience condemned them of wicked and flagitious actions, to decline the Communion, but to "stay out the prayer, and not leave the church till dismissed." This "prayer," again, is the "prayer of the faithful," which was followed by the blessing, "The peace of God be with you all," after which the kiss of peace was given, and the non-communicants withdrew².

At the close of the fourth century, S. Chrysostom is quite explicit. When some at Constantinople attempted to remain during the celebration without receiving, he rebuked them as follows:—

"Thou hearest the minister standing and crying, 'All you that are in penitence (under penance) depart.' Whosoever does not receive is in penitence: if thou art one of those in penitence, thou must not receive, for not to receive

¹ Clem. Lit.; see *infra*, p. 265.

² To quote this direction as applicable to our own Liturgy, where the Blessing comes after the Communion, is to mislead. On the remarks of Eusebius the Alexandrian, Mr. Scudamoc (*Notitia Euch.*) observes, that his words are "finish *thy* prayer," &c., distinguishing it from the public prayers. This was exactly provided for in the "prayer of silence," in which each having secretly offered his own petition, the deacon said the Bidding Prayer, and the bishop summed up in the *collect*, and then gave the peace.

is to be of those in penitence. To what purpose, then, does he say 'depart all ye that cannot join in the service', when thou impudently stayest? But thou art not of those (in penitence), but of those permitted to receive: and dost thou nothing care? dost thou deem this Thing nothing?"

In the next paragraph he remarks that the man in the parable, who had not on a wedding-garment, was expelled, not merely from the feast, but from the house in which it was celebrated.

"He did not say, why didst thou sit down? but, why camest thou in? And the same He now says to all of us who stand impudently and without shame: for every one who receives not the mysteries stands impudently and without shame. . . . Tell me if any one invited to a feast should wash his hands, sit down, and make ready for the banquet, and then not partake of it, would he not insult his host? *Would it not be better for such an one not to have been present?* In that state, then, thou art now present: thou hast sung the hymn, thou hast professed thyself to be among those worthy (to receive) in not departing with the unworthy: how canst thou stay, and not partake of the banquet? I am unworthy, he says,—then thou art unworthy of the communion in the prayers^c. For not only by the gifts, but by the hymns also, the Spirit is descending all around. Of these sights the eyes and ears (of the unworthy) are also unworthy."

After referring to the command in Exodus xix. 12, he proceeds:—

^b οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι δεηθῆναι—literally, "who are not able to pray," shewing that no one was admitted to the eucharistical prayers who was excluded from the sacrament.

^c τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκείνης τῆς ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς—another proof that the "prayers without the oblation," to which the penitents remained, were not the prayers of consecration.

“When He is present, depart: thou hast no more licence to stay than the catechumen. Not that it is by any means the same thing, never to have attained to the mysteries, and, after attaining to stumble at and despise them, and render thyself unworthy of this Thing^d.”

This last sentence completes the dilemma. By their own confession these persons were unworthy to receive; by the rule of the Church, and the nature of the rite, they could not be present and not receive; and if they retired with the penitents and catechumens, they would fall under the penalty of the canons and be excommunicate. The preacher could suggest but one way out of the dilemma. “We exhort you (he concludes) not to absent yourselves, but to become worthy both of the Presence and the *viaticum*.”

Still the people continued to withdraw, in such numbers that the archbishop complains, in another homily, that after preaching to an overflowing congregation, he had often to look round in vain for any attendants at the altar.

The difficulty arose from the want of spirituality in the mass of the population. Something had to be done to avoid the scandal of non-communicant spectators at the sacred banquet, without compelling any one to receive against his will. The only course open, was to authorize the departure of the unwilling. Being under no censure, they would naturally be sent out after the *consistentes*, and there would be less objection to their contributing to the offertory. Indeed, this privilege would be their only

^d In Ephes. Hom. iii. App. No. 3.

mark of distinction. Such was the course actually taken in the Western Church at the beginning of the sixth century. The Councils of Agde (A.D. 506) and Orleans (511), required all to remain on Sundays to the end of the *Missa**, and the blessing of the bishop or priest†. This blessing, it would seem, was then given after the oblation, instead of, as in the Greek Liturgies, before it. As the oblation comprised what we now call the Offertory and the Consecration, the non-communicant was so enabled to offer his gift and be present at the Commemoration, withdrawing before the Communion. This was the first step towards separating the sacrifice from the sacrament: it was still far short of remaining through the Communion without receiving.

From the Canons we proceed to the Liturgies referred to by the Trullan Council, of which the remains are still very numerous. No one now believes the legend, that the Apostles dictated to S. Clement of Rome the Liturgy which claims their sanction in the so-called

* "*Missas die dominico a sæcularibus totas teneri speciali ordinatione præcipimus, ita ut ante benedictionem sacerdotis egredi populus non præsumat.*"—*Conc. Agath.*, can. xlvii. "*Cum ad celebrandas missas in Dei nomine convenitur, populus non ante discedat quam missæ solemnitas compleatur, et ubi episcopus (non) fuerit benedictionem accipiet sacerdotis.*"—*Conc. Aur. I.*, can. xxvi.

† See the authorities cited by Bingham, xv. iii. 30. Bingham observes, that "what in Chrysostom's time was reckoned a crime, was presently after these canons accounted a piece of devotion, for the people to stay and hear the whole solemnity till the time of communicating, and then depart without partaking of the Communion; which was plainly a relaxation of the ancient discipline, and a deviation from the primitive practice." Even so, they did not remain *during* the administration. (Waterland's Review, c. xiv. p. 382.)

“Apostolical Constitutions^a.” Nor is there any better reason for ascribing to S. James, S. Mark, or S. Peter, the formularies known by their respective names. The historical fact, that new recensions were put out by S. Basil (*d.* 379), S. Chrysostom (*d.* 407), and many others, for the use of their respective Churches, is enough to shew that none was ever securely traced to an Apostolic pen, or held binding on the Church at large. Still, it will not be doubted by any who consider the nature of Jewish worship, and indeed of all public worship at the time, that the Christian Churches had their own stated order for Common Prayer, and the administration of the sacraments, from the very first. The Lord’s Prayer is, in itself, at once the germ and model of a Liturgy^b: we can well believe that its recitation formed part of every public office. Still this brief formulary could never have supplied the entire want, and there is evidence in the New Testament that other forms were in use. “Prayers” are mentioned in connexion with the breaking of breadⁱ, “supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks for all men^k ;” psalmody^l and lessons

^a The “Constitutions” are rejected as spurious and heretical by the same Greek Council that received the “Canons” as Apostolical (Conc. in Trull., can. 2). Nevertheless, they are admitted to be, in parts, of primitive antiquity. Dr. Von Drey, who is the latest authority, assigns the first six books to the latter half of the second century, and the remainder to the Nicene period. He conceives the whole to be of Syrian origin. The Liturgy is found in the eighth book.

^b Comp. Matt. vi. 9, “after this manner,” with the “when ye pray say,” of Luke xi. 2.

^l Acts ii. 42.

^k 1 Tim. ii. 1: S. Augustine expounds this text of the Eucharistic celebration, and assigns its several words to the corresponding parts of the Church’s Liturgy.

^l Eph. v. 19.

from the Old and New Testament^m, the Creedⁿ, the sermon^o, and the benediction (or consecration) of the elements^p, in which (as in the other sacrament of Baptism) the Lord's own words were religiously retained^q.

These are the main elements of all Christian Liturgies, and as we know that "ordinances" in regard to their use were issued by Apostolical authority^r, there is no reason to doubt that the arrangement of public worship was an important part of that "care of all the Churches," which naturally fell on their founders and fathers in Christ. It by no means follows that one uniform order was everywhere imposed. Each Apostle had his own authority, and the same founder may have seen cause for different uses in different countries. A large discretion, too, must have been left to the local Church authorities in further development, or the Liturgies now extant could never have come into existence^s.

On the other hand, there can be as little question that, in all essential features, the Apostolic ordinances would substantially agree, and each Church would naturally preserve the rites established by its founder, and sanctified by his name. These reasonable anticipations are just what we find verified by the facts of the case. The best authorities are agreed that

^m Acts xv. 21; Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27.

ⁿ 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

^o Acts xx. 9.

^p 1 Cor. x. 16.

^q 1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

^r 1 Cor. xi. 2, 16, 33, 34.

^s Thus Gregory of Rome enjoined our Augustine to compile an English Liturgy suited to the people, instead of binding them to the use of the Roman Church.

down to the legal establishment of the Church by Constantine the Great, the ritual was continued by oral tradition, aided by a few written formulæ entrusted to the several bishops, and carefully guarded from the searches of their persecutors. There was no written Liturgy publicly known before the time of Constantine; still, there are unmistakable allusions to a contemporary ritual in the extant writings of the ante-Nicene period. S. Clement of Rome, a fellow-labourer with the Apostles, institutes a comparison between the Christian worship and that of the Temple at Jerusalem, then still in existence, employing the same liturgical terms—*προσφορὰς, λειτουργίας, ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*—which we find in the Septuagint and in the present Liturgies.

Ignatius, another contemporary of the Apostles, mentions the “altar” and the “Eucharist,” a name given to the consecrated elements as well as to the whole service. Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in the second century, dwell upon it as the sacrifice of the New Testament, ordained by Christ Himself in place of the Old Testament worship, and expressly predicted by the prophet Malachi¹. The former supplies a description of the ritual observed within a few years of the death of S. John. This may be here transcribed, reserving the rest to their proper place in the next chapter but one.

“On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place², and the memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased, the

¹ Mal. i. 10—12.

² Comp. Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 20; xvi. 2.

president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray; and when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings as he is able, and the people assent, saying, *Amen*; and the distribution and participation of the things over which the thanksgiving has been offered, is made to each, and to those who are not present it is sent by the deacons. The affluent and willing give at their pleasure each what he likes, and what is collected is deposited with the president (for orphans, widows, &c.). But we make Sunday the day of our coming together, because it is the first day, in which God changing darkness and matter made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead."

The previous chapters contain a somewhat fuller account of the Eucharistic Liturgy:—

"Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss^{*}. There is then brought to the president[†] of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at great length[‡] for our being counted worthy to receive these things at his hands. And when he has concluded the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present express their assent by saying *Amen*. This word

^{*} It was probably after this salutation that the *consistentes* of the Nicene Canon were to withdraw. See *ante*, p. 251.

[†] τῷ προστάτῃ, *antistes*, prelate.

[‡] See the *long* prayer in the Clementine Liturgy. In cap. lxxvii., Justin says he offers prayers and thanksgivings "as he is able," which very expression is found in this prayer—"not as we ought, but as we are able." *Inf.*, p. 267.

Amen answers in the Hebrew language to *γένοιτο* (so be it). And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine and water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion^a. And this food is called among us *Εὐχαριστία* (the Eucharist), of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is ordained for the remission of sins and regeneration, and who is so living as Christ enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these: but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of the Word delivered by Him, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished^b, is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus Who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels, delivered unto us that Jesus thus commanded them; that He having taken bread, and given thanks, said, 'This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My Body;' and that after the same manner having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, 'This is My Blood;' and gave it to them alone to partake of^c."

The "long thanksgiving," to which the people say *Amen* (and which gave name at once to the whole office and the consecrated elements), may be compared with the rite referred to by S. Paul^d. Moreover,

^a No "reservation" for future use is implied.

^b Compare

Irenæus, *inf.* ch. xi.

^c Apol. i. (ad Anton. Pium), cap. lxx.—lxxvii., App. No. 3.

^d 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

coupling the words here used with those of the Apostle's own consecration^e, it would appear that the technical terms *eulogia* and *eucharist* were in use from the first.

Again, the phrase "as he is able," which may be compared with the Apostle's "thou verily givest thanks well," is found in these very words in the earliest of the extant Liturgies. Such expressions, together with the whole character of the service, serve to connect the substance of the Apostolic ritual with that of the forms subsequently written out.

The First General Council was called to verify the Apostolic Creed, by a collation of the several forms in which it had been traditionally received in the several Churches. In like manner, the traditional Liturgies were now reduced to writing by the authority of the ecclesiastical rulers, though none was ever imposed for universal observance. Hence came the "Liturgy of S. James," i.e. of the Church of Jerusalem, or the patriarchate of Antioch, comprehending Judæa, Mesopotamia, Syria, and some of the southern parts of Asia Minor. This was revised and adapted to his own patriarchate by Basil the great Archbishop of Cæsarea (*cons.* A.D. 370), whose jurisdiction included the greater part of Asia Minor; and again by S. Chrysostom (*d.* 407), for the patriarchate of Constantinople, which succeeded to the supremacy of Cæsarea. These three represent the "Great Oriental Liturgy." The "Liturgy of S. Mark" is the Alexandrian rite, ascribed to the evangelist as the founder and first bishop of the rival patriarchate of Alexandria. This was revised by S. Cyril (*d.* 444).

• 1 Cor. x. 16.

From the wide extent of country in which these two Liturgies prevailed, and the independence of the Churches which used them, it is reasonably concluded that their substance, at least, was derived from the Apostles themselves, though the names of S. James and S. Mark may have been first given when the ancient rituals were revised by S. Basil and S. Cyril, and the details must be open to criticism¹.

From these Liturgies, or other similar sources, a variety of offices were compiled at different times and places, of which as many as a hundred are still extant, in whole or in part. The variety is of itself conclusive, that no one Liturgy was ever binding on the whole Church; still, there is similarity enough to shew a common derivation. This might perhaps be traced to its primitive and Apostolic source, if we now possessed the actual Liturgies of the fourth and fifth centuries. Here, however, is the weak point of the evidence. The oldest MS. extant—one of Basil and Chrysostom's Liturgies—is dated by Montfaucon A.D. 691; of S. James's we have a MS. of the tenth century; of S. Mark's one of the tenth or eleventh. These MSS. are no more the actual Liturgies of the fourth century than Chrysostom's was the Liturgy of Basil, or Basil's of S. James. They come to us with the interpolations and adaptations of at least three centuries; they represent the age, not of the four General Councils, but, at the earliest, of the sixth and seventh, when the Constantinopolitan rite already varied, in some respects, from S. Chrysostom's. Moreover, reasons have been adduced for suspecting some

¹ Palmer's Dissert. on Liturgies, s. iii.; *Orig. Liturgicæ*.

important departures from the Apostolic age even before the fourth century^g. Hence the differences are as important as the agreements: no feature can be pronounced ancient which is found only in a few Liturgies; only where they all agree, can it be safely inferred, that they retain the original deposit.

The attempt at distinguishing the later accretions is much assisted by another Liturgy, which, though not the actual use of any particular Church, is probably the oldest and least interpolated of any now extant. This is the Liturgy ascribed to S. Clement of Rome in the Apostolical Constitutions—a collection of uncertain date, but undoubtedly preserving many records of genuine antiquity. The Liturgy is generally allowed to be ante-Nicene; Dr. Neale conceives it to be hardly later than the age of S. Clement and Justin Martyr, and it certainly answers very closely to their descriptions. It is supposed to have been taken down in writing by a private hand from the service of the time, and not being the authorized formulary of any particular Church, it has escaped the successive revisions and emendations of later Bishops. It differs from the Liturgy of S. James chiefly in greater simplicity of language and ritual, another strong presumption in favour of its antiquity. Some have thought, that “if we had the very form in which the Apostles ministered the Holy Communion it would be found in all essential points the same^h.” If we compare this

^g Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," ii. 3.

^h Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice;" Brett's Liturgies. See also Pearson's Vind. Ign., and Grabe's Spicel. Patr., i. 284. Eusebius (E. H., iii. 25,) mentions a collection of the "Doctrines of the Apostles," which

Liturgy with the others, they will be found to present a very close agreement in what is called the *anaphora*, or oblatory portion of the service, that is to say, the Consecration or Canon; while the portions before and after present such expansions and divergencies as might be expected to arise in the progress of ceremonial development.

In the Clementine Liturgy, "after the reading of the Law and the Prophets, with the Epistles, Acts, and Gospels," the bishop salutes the Church in the Apostle's wordsⁱ, and proceeds to his sermon; then proclamation is made by a deacon for the withdrawal of hearers and unbelievers, and when quiet has been made, the prayer of the Catechumens is offered, and they are dismissed; then follow severally the prayer and dismissal of the *energumens*^k, of the *illuminated*^l, and of those in penitence. When the last are gone, the faithful are commanded to kneel; and this would appear to be the place for the "silent prayer" of the Laodicean Canon^m. It is followed by the Bidding Prayer, in which the deacon briefly enumerates the various classes and conditions of men, and then, all rising up, the bishop sums up the petitions in

is thought to be incorporated in another work, also ascribed to S. Clement in the eighty-fifth of the "Apostolical Canons," but rejected as fictitious and heretical in the second Quinisext Canon, A.D. 692. Bunsen would assign the Liturgy to the middle of the third century, Krabbe to the end of the fourth, and Drey (whom Hefele pronounces the best authority) to the "Nicene period," and a *Syriac* origin.

ⁱ 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

^k The afflicted with evil spirits; who were allowed, however, to communicate during the intervals of self-possession.

^l The catechumens about to be baptized.

^m See *ante*, p. 251.

a *Collect*. These are the "three prayers of the faithful:" after which the Bishop says "The peace of God be with you;" the people respond "and with thy spirit," and the kiss of peace is interchanged^a. This concludes the *pro-anaphoral* part, and it is here that, according to the Nicene Canon, the *consistentes* would withdraw.

The doors being then shut, the priests wash their hands, and the *anaphora* commences with the oblations of the people, who are directed to stand, in charity and without hypocrisy, and make their offerings to the Lord. The offerings are brought by the deacons to the bishop at the altar^o, who, after a private prayer, assumes his "shining vestment^p," and, making the sign of the cross, repeats the Grace^q. Then, beginning with the *sursum corda* and *vere dignum*, he proceeds with a long ascription of praise and thanksgiving, closing with the *Seraphic Hymn*, "Holy, holy^r," &c. The Thanksgiving is then renewed for the special mercies of the Incarnation, and concludes with reciting the *Institution* of the Eucharist; then follow the *Oblation* and *Benediction*,

^a Comp. Justin Martyr, *ante*, p. 259.

^o Sir W. Palmer (*Orig. Liturg.*, c. iv.) thinks that in the Eastern Church the oblations of the people were not made during the Liturgy, but sent in before. From these offerings the celebrant selected the bread and wine for the Eucharist, (see Can. Ap., iii. *ante*, p. 243).

^p Probably of white linen. S. Chrysostom mentions a similar garment as worn by the deacons.

^q 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

^r This is the *Ter sanctus* of the Latin Liturgies, and is not to be confounded with the *Trisagios* of the Greeks, "Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Eternal, have mercy upon us;" a hymn not used in the Eucharistic thanksgiving, and not introduced into the other offices till after the death of Basil.

which will presently be produced in full; then the *Intercessions* for the Church, living and dead; then a prayer of humble access; and then the exclamation, "Holy things for holy persons." The Communion follows: the bishop (who is here the celebrant) receiving first, and then the presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, and ascetics; next the women, deaconesses, virgins, widows; afterwards the children; and finally, "all the people, in order, with fear and reverence, without tumult or noise." In giving the oblation the bishop says, "The Body of Christ," the receiver answering, "*Amen*." The deacon, with the cup, says, "The Blood of Christ, the cup of life;" and the receiver repeats his "*Amen*." Hence the Communion was clearly in both kinds. The 33rd Psalm is to be sung while the people are communicating, and when "all both men and women have received," the deacons are directed to carry the remains of the consecrated elements into the sacristy. The Post-Communion prayers follow, and the deacon gives the final dismissal, "Depart in peace*."

Such, according to the Clementine Liturgy, was the Eucharistic Office of the Ante-Nicene Church. It contains in the *anaphora* six leading features:—

1. The Thanksgiving, closing with the Seraphic Hymn;
2. The Commemoration, ending with the words of Institution;
3. The Oblation of the Elements;

* This is not to be confounded with the "blessing," for which, by the French Canons, the non-communicants were to remain. That blessing was given by the celebrant after the oblation.

4. The Invocation, or Benediction ;
5. The Intercessions ; and
6. The Communion in both kinds by all present.

These features, and these only, uniformly recur in all the other Liturgies ; often in the same words, and always to the same sense. The order of the several parts is for the most part the same ; but in the Alexandrian and Ethiopic Liturgies the Intercessions *begin* the Service, immediately on the Gifts being set upon the altar, as in the present English Liturgy. In the others they intervene between the Benediction and the Communion, as in the Clementine model[†]. A still greater departure from the primitive usage is charged upon *all* these Liturgies by Archdeacon Freeman, who maintains that in the first century the Invocation *preceded* the words of Institution, as in the First Book of Edward VI.

In the Clementine Liturgy, the Commemoration continues in this way :—

“ Having therefore in remembrance all that He endured for our sakes, we give thanks to Thee, O God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able[‡], and fulfil His Institution. For in the same night that He was betrayed, having taken bread into His holy and immaculate hands, and looking up[‡] to Thee, His God and Father, and breaking it, He gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the Mystery of the New Testa-

[†] Dr. Brett's Collection, London, 1720. The originals are in the Appendix to Johnson's "Unbloody Sacrifice," (1714), and have been also published by Dr. J. M. Neale, in one volume, (1868). A translation by the same author was published in 1859. See also Renaudot and the other Liturgists.

[‡] Compare Justin Martyr.

[‡] Not in the Gospel accounts of the Supper, but in Luke ix. 16, and in John xvii. 1.

ment; take of it, eat, this is My Body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise also having mingled the cup of wine and water, and blessed it, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; this is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do shew forth My death till I come⁷.

“Wherefore having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the Dead, His Ascension into Heaven, and His future second Appearance, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to His works, we offer to Thee our King and God, according to His institution, this bread and this cup; giving thanks to Thee through Him that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to minister (τεραπεύειν²) unto Thee. And we beseech Thee that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient God, and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ.

“And send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this sacrifice^a (θυσίαν), that He may make^b (exhibit) this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ; in order that all who shall partake of it may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and

⁷ It is remarkable that these words of S. Paul are attributed in the Liturgies to the original Institution, shewing how inseparable in the tradition of the Church the *receiving* was from the *sacrifice*.

^a The word applied to Aaron's ministry in the Septuagint, Exod. xxviii. 1, 3, 4; xxix. 1, and frequently. Dr. Neale translates it “sacrifice,” but in the Greek this is usually expressed by *θύω*, or *θυσιάζω*.

^a i.e. the *oblata* or “gifts,” which, Sir W. Palmer observes, it is impossible to deny, are here described as an oblation or sacrifice of bread and wine to God.—(*Orig. Lit.*, iv. 10.)

^b ἀποφύνη, from ἀποφάνω, ostendo, efficio, reddo, &c.

his wiles, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled to them."

S. James's Liturgy, or that of the Jerusalem patriarchate, reads thus, omitting *rubrics* and interjections:—

"Who being about to suffer His voluntary and life-giving death upon the cross, the Sinless for us sinners, in the same night that He was delivered up, or rather delivered up Himself for the life and salvation of the world, having taken bread into His holy, immaculate, undefiled, and immortal hands, looking up to heaven, and shewing it to Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks, sanctified, brake, and gave it to us His disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body, which is broken and given for you for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Likewise, after supper, having taken the cup and mixed it of wine and water, and looked up to heaven, and shewed it to Thee His God and Father, He gave thanks, sanctified, blessed, and filled it with the Holy Ghost, and gave it to us His disciples, saying, Drink ye all of this; this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you and for many, for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Do this in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the death of the Son of Man, and confess His resurrection till He come.

"Wherefore, we sinners also having in remembrance His life-giving passion, salutary cross, death, burial, and resurrection on the third day from the dead, His ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of Thee His God and Father, and His second glorious and terrible appearing, when He shall come with glory to judge the living and the dead, and will render to every man according to his works; we offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacri-

fi^c, beseeching Thee not to deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities; but according to Thy clemency and ineffable love to mankind, overlook and blot out the handwriting that is against us Thy suppliants, and grant us Thine heavenly and eternal rewards, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, which Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee; and reject not this people for me and my sins, O gracious Lord, for Thy people and Thy Church make their supplications before Thee.

“Have mercy upon us, O God the Almighty, have mercy upon us, O God our Saviour, have mercy upon us, O God, according to Thy great mercy, and send down upon us and upon these gifts, here lying before Thee, Thy all-holy Spirit; the Lord and Giver of life, who with Thee, O God the Father, and with Thine only-begotten Son, liveth and reigneth; the consubstantial and co-eternal^d; who spake in the Law, the Prophets, and Thy New Testament, who descended in the form of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, and rested upon Him, who came down in the shape of fiery tongues upon Thy Apostles, in the upper room of the holy and glorious Sion, on the day of Pentecost: Send down, O Lord, this Thy most Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy gifts here set before Thee; that He may come upon them with His holy, good, and glorious Presence, and may sanctify and make this bread the holy Body of Thy Christ. (Amen.) And this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ. (Amen.) That it may be to those who partake thereof for remission of sins and eternal life, for sanctification of souls and bodies, for bringing forth the fruit

^c ἀναμικτρον θυσιαν. Cyril's Catechism has the words ἀναμικτρον λατρεiαν. Sir W. Palmer understands it of the whole service, since the words are too strong for the unconsecrated elements. Orig. Lit., iv. 10.

^d Evidently inserted after the Second General Council, (A.D. 381).

of good works, for the confirmation of Thy Holy Catholic Church, which Thou hast founded upon the rock of faith*, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it; delivering it from all heresy and scandals, and from the workers of iniquity, and preserving it to the consummation of the age."

S. Basil's Liturgy, as retained on the great festivals in the patriarchate of Constantinople, is in these words:—

"For when He was just going to His voluntary, glorious, and life-giving death, on the same night wherein He gave up Himself for the life of the world, having taken bread into His holy and immaculate hands, and shewed it to Thee His God and Father, He gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, brake, and gave it to His holy disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body, which is broken for you, for the remission of sins. (Amen.) In like manner, having taken, mixed, given thanks, blessed, sanctified the cup of the fruit of the vine, He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles, saying, Drink ye all of this: this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Do this in remembrance of Me: for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shew forth My death and confess My resurrection.

"Having therefore in remembrance, O Lord, His saving Passion, His life-giving cross, His lying in the grave for three days, His resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven, His session at the right hand of Thee His God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second appearing; through all, and in all, we offer to Thee Thine own out of Thine own. Wherefore, O most holy Lord, we Thy sinful and unworthy servants, to whom Thou hast vouchsafed the honour to minister at Thy holy altar, not upon

* Observe the Greek conception of the "rock," (Matt. xvi. 18).

account of our own righteousness, (for we have done no good thing upon earth,) but according to Thy mercies and compassions, which Thou hast liberally poured upon us, boldly approach Thy holy altar;

“And laying before Thee the antitypes¹ of the holy Body and Blood of Thy Christ, we pray and beseech Thee, O Thou Holy of Holies, of Thy gracious goodness to send down Thine Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts² here lying before Thee, to bless, to sanctify, and to exhibit them, this bread the precious Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ. (Amen.) And this cup the precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, shed for the life of the world. (Amen.) *Changing them by Thy Holy Spirit.* (Amen, Amen, Amen.) And all us who partake of this one Bread, and this Cup, unite one to another in the Communion of one Holy Spirit,” &c.

In this extract the words, “changing them by Thy Holy Spirit,” which are not found in the two earlier liturgies, are stated by Goar to be wanting in the most ancient MSS., and are consequently an interpolation of uncertain date. The participle “changing” is from the same verb, which in the next sentence is translated “partake;” it means therefore no more than that the Spirit effects a change of mystical relation in the

¹ ἀντίτυπα. This word is translated “figures” in Heb. ix. 24, and “like figure” in 1 Pet. iii. 21. In both places the meaning is something more than a bare type. The holy places made with hands were in some degree *inhabited* by the Presence in the heavens. And Baptism is the actual instrument of that salvation, of which the preservation of Noah was a type. A *type* is the sign of a thing not present, but *antitype* is as nearly as possible equivalent to our word “sacrament,”—not only “the sign of a sacred thing,” but the sign of that thing *given unto us*;—“a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.” ² The bread and wine, as in the Clement. Lit.

bread, not of substance, since it is still bread in the reception.

The ordinary Liturgy of Constantinople, attributed to S. John Chrysostom, the latest and most amplified of all, retains the critical clauses in these words:—

“In the night wherein He was delivered up, or rather delivered up Himself, for the life of the world, having taken bread into His holy, spotless, and undefiled hands, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Likewise also the Cup after Supper, saying, Drink ye all of it: this is My Blood, that of the New Testament, which for you and for many is shed, for remission of sins. (Amen.)

“Having therefore in remembrance this command of our Saviour, and all those things which were done for us,—the cross, the sepulchre, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the sitting at Thy right hand, the second coming in glory,—by all and through all things^b we offer to Thee Thine own, out of Thine own. Moreover we offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody worship; (*λατρείαν*ⁱ).

^b Here several ritual ceremonies are interpolated, but the prayer continues without break. Dr. Neale translates “on behalf of all, and for all,” omitting “*things*,” which the neuter of the original requires to be supplied. The words are found more at length in the opening of S. Mark’s Liturgy, where Dr. Neale himself reads, “we give thanks for all things, and through all things, and in all things.” Comp. Eph. v. 20; Heb. xiii. 15.

ⁱ Observe the double oblation: 1. of the bread and wine, (“Thine own, out of Thine own”); 2. (“*moreover*”) of the service or representation of Christ’s death, which is the reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, as in

“And we call upon Thee, we pray and beseech Thee, send down Thine Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts set before Thee : and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ ; (Amen.) and what is in this cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ ; (Amen.) changing them by Thy Holy Spirit, (Amen, Amen, Amen.) so as to be to those who partake, for cleanness of soul, for remission of sins, for communion of the Holy Ghost, for fulness of the kingdom of heaven, for confidence towards Thee, and not for judgment or condemnation.”

The Alexandrine Liturgy, which probably represents an independent tradition consecrated by the name of the founder S. Mark, differs from the foregoing in beginning the *anaphora* with a brief Thanksgiving, and then proceeding at once to the Intercessions. The Thanksgiving contains the clause:—

“By whom giving thanks to Thee, with Him and the Holy Ghost, we offer this reasonable and unbloody worship (*λατρείαν*), which all nations offer to Thee, O Lord, from the rising to the setting of the sun, from the north unto the south. For great is Thy name among all nations ; and in every place incense is offered to Thy holy Name, and sacrifice, and oblation¹.”

These expressions in this place may have exercised some effect on the Offices of the Church of Rome, which always cherished a closer intercourse with Alexandria than with the rival sees of Antioch and Con-

S. James. No Liturgy (not even the modern Roman, as we shall see,) contains any verbal oblation of Christ's Body and Blood.—Palmer's *Orig. Lit.*, iv. 10.

¹ Compare Mal. i. 11.

stantinople. Nevertheless, they are only a preliminary thanksgiving, introductory to the intercessions, as in 1 Tim. ii. 1. The proper Eucharistic oblation follows in the usual place after the Seraphic hymn:—

“For our Lord Himself, our God and supreme King Jesus Christ, in the night wherein He delivered Himself up for our sins, to be put to death in the flesh ^{*} for all, sitting down to supper with His holy disciples and apostles, having taken bread in His holy, spotless, and undefiled hands, and looked up to His Father, our God and the God of all, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, He gave it to His holy and blessed disciples and apostles, saying, Take, eat; for this is My Body, which is broken for you, and given for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Likewise, having taken the cup after supper, and mixed it of wine and water, having looked up to heaven, to Thee His Father, our God and the God of all, given thanks, blessed, filled it with the Holy Ghost, He gave it to His holy and blessed disciples and apostles, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which, for you, and for many, is shed and given for the remission of sins. (Amen.) Do this for My remembrance: for as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shew forth My death, and confess My resurrection and ascension, till I come.

“Shewing forth, therefore, O Lord Almighty, Heavenly King, the death of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and confessing His blessed resurrection from the dead on the third day, we also confess His ascension into heaven, and His session at the right hand of Thee His God and Father; also looking for His second

^{*} Καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑψίστατον θάνατον σαρκί: there is some defect in the text; perhaps the verb “suffered” is omitted: σαρκί seems to refer to 1 Pet. iii. 18.

terrible and dreadful appearing, when He shall come to judge the quick and dead in righteousness, and to render to every man according to his works: We, O Lord God, have set before Thee Thine own, out of Thy own gifts.

“And we pray and beseech Thee, O Thou lover of mankind, send down from Thy holy height, from the place of Thy dwelling, from Thine infinite bosom, the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, the Holy One, the Lord, the Giver of life, who spake in the law, the prophets, and the apostles; who is everywhere present, filling all things, and working sanctification of Himself, not ministerially, upon whom He will according to Thy good pleasure; simple in nature, various in operation, the fountain of all divine graces; consubstantial with Thee, proceeding from Thee, sitting with Thee in the throne of Thy kingdom, and of Thine only-begotten Son our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Send down Thine Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these loaves and these cups, that He as Almighty God may sanctify and consecrate (τελειώσῃ) them. And may make the bread the Body, (Amen,) and the cup the Blood, of the New Testament of our Lord Himself, our God and Saviour and supreme King, Jesus Christ; that they may be to all us who partake of them, for faith, for healing, for cleansing, for temperance, for sanctification, for renewing of soul, body, and spirit; for communion of the blessedness of eternal life and immortality; for the glorifying of Thy holy Name, for remission of sins; that in this and in all things, Thy holy, honourable, and glorious Name may, together with Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, be glorified, praised, and hallowed. (*Response*) As it was and is¹.”

These extracts have been corrected from Dr. Neale's revision of Dr. Brett's translations, omitting rubrics and interjectory anthems, interpolated at uncertain times.

¹ App. No. 2.

Dr. Brett's collection includes another Alexandrian Liturgy by S. Basil, the Ethiopian use taken from S. Mark's, with the Nestorian and Monophysite Liturgies of Chaldea and Syria, all to the same effect. Other forms have been collected by Sir William Palmer; and Dr. Neale has further translated the formulæ of Institution as they occur in every extant Liturgy, incontestably confirming the universal agreement of the Eastern Church in the points now under review.

In the words of Institution only the Roman, Ambrosian, and Malabar (of which the Synod of Diamper has not left a single unadulterated copy) give the contracted form, "This is My Body." All the orthodox Oriental Liturgies (and almost all the others) retain the more correct designation of the Body *broken* and the Blood *shed* for the remission of sins. In all, the Institution precedes the Invocation and the Benediction. Consequently, the oblation is always of the *unconsecrated* elements, designated by the words of Institution to be the memorials of the Passion, but not yet invested with the character of the Body and Blood. They are offered as the bread and the cup (so named in the oblation) to commemorate Christ's sacrifice, and to be sanctified as the means of communicating its benefits to the receivers. Then the Holy Ghost is invoked to descend upon these symbols, and make them the Body and Blood *for the purpose of Communion*. This petition completes the consecration, and imparts the spiritual virtue^m. After this, *nothing*

^m In still earlier times, when, according to Archdeacon Freeman, the Invocation preceded the Institution, the consecration was due to the

is offered but prayer and thanksgiving, with the living sacrifice of the bodies and souls of the communicants.

Hence it appears that the “unbloody oblation” of the undivided Church was not in any sense a sacrifice of Christ, or of His Body and Blood, but of their *symbols*, to be made His Body and Blood in the consecration. This has always been the doctrine of the Eastern Churches: it was laid down with great clearness in the Seventh General Council at Constantinople (A.D. 754):—

“The true image of Christ—which He, our High Priest and God, who took our nature wholly upon Him, did at the time of His voluntary Passion deliver to His priests as a most emphatic type and memorial of Himself.”

After a recital of the Institution as in the Liturgies, the decree proceeds:—

“He commanded chosen materials, that is, the substance of bread, to be offered as His image, not in man’s form, lest there should be occasion for idolatry. As, therefore, the natural Body of Christ is holy, being deifiedⁿ, so it is evident that His Body by adoption—that is, His image—is holy, as being through a certain sanctification deified^o by grace. This, therefore, (as we have said,) our Master Christ plainly intended; that as He deified the flesh which He took on Him by the natural necessary holiness of the union itself, so it was His good pleasure that the bread of the Eucharist, as the true image of His natural flesh, being sanctified by the descent of the Holy Ghost, should become a divine Body, by changing that which was common into

entire action of invocation, and institution, with manual handling of the elements.

ⁿ θεωθεῖν, aor.

^o θεομενῆν, pres.

holy, through the mediation of the priest who makes the oblation^p."

The image-worshippers of the Second Nicene Council^q, in condemning this passage, asserted that none of the Fathers had ever styled the unbloody sacrifice an "image," though they admitted the use of the word "antitypes." The Council of Frankfort also censured the word "image," understanding it to mean a "prefiguration," or "*typical* memorial, like the transient shadows of the law," whereas Christ has given us "the sacrament of His Body and Blood." They meant that a sacrament is the sign of a *present* grace, not a foreshadowed one; and this, of course, is true. Nevertheless, both "image" and "type," as well as "antitype," are unquestionably found in the Fathers.

The Greek doctrine of consecration must have been originally the same with that of the Latin Church, since it formed no part of the first differences, and no complaint is heard on either side till long after the schism. The first dispute on this point was at the Council of Florence, (A.D. 1439,) long after the reception of transubstantiation in the West. The Latin divines then succeeded in obtaining some explanation from the Greeks, but the Pope was so little satisfied with it, that he refused to have it inserted in the Acts, and it was promptly disallowed, with all the rest of the proceedings, at Constantinople. The Greek bishops who had agreed to it were driven from their sees, and the single dissident, Mark of Ephesus, was

^p Johnson's App., 51. Mendham's Translation, 354.

^q The pseudo Seventh General, A.D. 787.

loaded with commendations. This bishop afterwards wrote a treatise, to prove that the Divine gifts are not consecrated by the words of Institution only, but by the subsequent prayer and benediction of the priest. He insists that—

“No apostle or doctor of the Church ever consecrated the Eucharistic gifts with our Lord’s words only, but that all of them with one consent, first indeed by way of narrative recited those words, putting us in mind of what was then done, and so qualifying the oblation for the change, but then after that added the prayer and blessing of the priest, to change what were already the gifts into the very prototype, the Lord’s Body, in energy¹.”

Here we have the true account of the “virtual” theory, imperfectly apprehended by Calvin. The words of Institution make the elements symbols or *antitypes* of the crucified Body and outshed Blood; the Benediction advances them into the *prototype* — i.e. the reality of the symbols. But as the Body and Blood no longer exist in that state of crucifixion, the symbols are made so in *energy*—i.e. in power and effect to the communicant. There is no conversion or union to the *glorified* Body, nor is *that* the thing signified by the Sacrament. Both parties clearly saw the effect of this doctrine of consecration on the nature of the oblation; perhaps it was this difference in the Eucharistic sacrifice, as much as the Double Procession, which induced the uncompromising Mark of Ephesus to pronounce the Latin dogmas *heretical*.

¹ ἐνεργείᾳ μεταποιεῖν ἤδη τὰ δῶρα πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ πρωτότυπον ἐκείνο σῶμα τὸ δεσποτικόν. Arcud. de Conc. Ecc. Occ. and Orient. iii. 28. Brett. Diss., p. 147.

On the Participation of the sacrifice the Liturgies, though less express, are still sufficiently clear. The Communion was manifestly received by all who were present at the celebration, and in both kinds. This is shewn by the dismissal of the catechumens, unbelievers, and non-communicants, before the commencement of the *anaphora*,—by the invitations addressed to the faithful,—and by the words employed in the distribution, independently of rubrics where they exist. In S. Chrysostom's Liturgy, after the communion of the clergy, the deacon goes to the chancel door, and shewing the elements to the people, says, "Draw near in the faith and fear of God." To the same effect is the exclamation in the other Liturgies, "Holy things to holy persons," which immediately precedes the administration; the people responding, "There is one holy, one Lord," &c. The exclamation is accompanied by an elevation of the gifts in the Liturgy of S. James, but without any mark of *adoration*, as in our own Sarum Use. S. James's Liturgy contains a thanksgiving after the reception: S. Mark's preserves the words of distribution, "The holy Body—the precious Blood—of our Lord, our God and Saviour."

It may be observed, that the Eastern practice was to *stand* throughout the prayers on the Lord's Day, consequently the sacrament was received in the same posture. But the head and body were bowed in profound reverence: the Liturgies contain several allusions to this practice, but have no trace of any other kind of "adoration."

All the Liturgies speak of the chalice as containing wine mixed with water, recited as part of the

original action, without the mystical explanations subsequently assigned*. The fact was probably so; but the water was never deemed a formal part of the Institution. Still, if the cup represented (as was universally believed) the blood and water that issued from the side of Jesus on the cross, it is another reference to the sacrifice of His *death*. So, again, the union of the two elements, found in the later forms, and constituting one of the most marked innovations on the ante-Nicene ritual, originated from the old thought of the *dead* Body and *outshed* Blood. The priest put a piece of the consecrated bread into the chalice, saying, in S. James's Liturgy,—

“The union of the most holy Body and precious Blood of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ. The union is made, sanctified, and completed, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

In S. Chrysostom's Liturgy the words are,—

“The fulness of faith is of the Holy Ghost.”

And there is a further order to put some *warm* water into the cup, saying,—

“The fervency of faith is of the Holy Ghost.”

Hence the warm water was then supposed to denote the descent of the Holy Ghost.

These innovations speak trumpet-tongued of inter-

* The Council of Trent combines the three reasons: the Institution of Christ, the blood and water on the cross, and S. Cyprian's ingenious application of Rev. xvii. 15, making the water to represent the people united to Christ in this sacrifice; see p. 205.

polation. The "union" is held to be as old as the fifth century, because it is found in the Nestorian Churches, which separated from the orthodox communion at that time. But this was just one of those dramatic rites that would find favour on both sides the pale, when the endeavour had begun to localize in material elements the objects presented in the mysteries to faith. The *Rationale*, published in England in the reign of Henry VIII., explains the "commixtion of the Body and Blood of Christ together, as signifying the joining together of His Body and Soul at the resurrection, which before was severed at the time of His Passion^t." The two elements were still understood to represent the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and their re-union (before the doctrine of concomitance was invented) was the first step in the grand error which substituted "whole Christ" in the place of His Body and Blood. It was followed by a practice, still retained throughout the Greek Church, of communicating the two kinds *together*, from the chalice or a spoon. This practice was expressly forbidden by the Council in Trullo; and in Cyril's Fifth Catechism (A.D. 350) there are precise directions to the communicant, how to receive each element *separately*. This early "Companion to the Altar" supplies conclusive proof that no union was then practised in the Liturgy of Jerusalem.

Before we quit the Eastern Liturgies, some notice must be taken of the prayers which they contain for the dead. These have been manifestly subjected to

^t Collier, E. H., part ii, book 3; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18, "quickened by the Spirit."

continuous amplification, and were altogether absent from the Syriac Liturgy of S. James, where the departed were mentioned only with *thanksgiving*; the supplications afterwards inserted are inconsistent with the original expressions. The Clementine Liturgy, immediately after the consecration, proceeds:—

“We further pray unto Thee, O Lord, for Thy holy Church, spread from the one end of the world unto the other, which Thou hast purchased by the precious Blood of Thy Christ.” After specifying the episcopate, the priests, deacons, and whole clergy, the king, with all in authority, and the army, it proceeds, “Further, we offer unto Thee for all the saints who have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, righteous men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names Thou knowest.”

It was at this part that the persons entered in the *diptychs* were enumerated by name. The word “offer,” following close on the oblation and consecration of the sacrament, might at first sight countenance the notion that the consecrated elements were offered on their behalf, as in the modern sacrifice of the Mass. But on looking further we perceive that this word “offer” is so interchanged throughout with words of simple petition, as to prove that no other offering but prayer is intended. The commendations are presented in this way:—

“We *pray* for the Holy Church,” &c. “We *call upon Thee* for my unworthiness who am now offering,” &c. “We *call upon Thee* for the king,” &c. “We *offer* to Thee for

all the saints," &c. "We *further offer* for this people, the virgins, widows, wives, and children," &c. "We *pray* unto Thee for this city, the sick, captives, exiles, prisoners," &c. "We *beseech* Thee for those who hate us, and for all that are without," &c. "We *pray* unto Thee for the catechumens, the possessed, and the penitents," &c. "We *offer* unto Thee for seasonable weather and the fruits of the earth," &c.; and finally, "We *pray* for the absent upon just cause," &c.

No reason can be assigned for offering *sacrifice* for the people, virgins, widows, and for seasonable weather, and *prayer* only for the bishops and clergy, the king, the city, the catechumens, penitents, and absentees. The "offering" is plainly that of prayer and supplication throughout, though undoubtedly prayer and supplication were deemed most effectual at the sacramental remembrance of the Lord's death, since by His mediation all our addresses are presented to the throne of grace. This conclusion is confirmed by the African canon, which directs the dead to be commended in prayer alone when the Eucharist cannot be celebrated:—

"The sacraments of the altar are to be celebrated fasting, except on the single anniversary of the Lord's Supper. But if there be a commendation of the dead, whether bishops or others, in the evening, let it be celebrated with prayers alone if the officiating ministers have dined."

The "commendations" were plainly at the hour of death, otherwise there could be no necessity for celebrating them in the evening. The dying person would receive the *viaticum* from a morning consecra-

^a Conc. Cart. III., can. xxix. App. No. 2.

tion, but there was a further service for the repose of the soul at or immediately after its departure. The direction to omit the sacrament, for the reason here assigned, shews that prayer was the primary object of the office ^x.

In the Liturgy of S. James, the commendations are mostly introduced with the word "remember." Those for the departed run thus :—

"Remember, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, the faithful whom we have commemorated, or whom we have not mentioned, from righteous Abel unto this day. Make them to rest in the region of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the joys of Paradise, in the bosom of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, our holy fathers, where there is no sorrow, grief, or lamentation, and where the light of Thy countenance continually shines upon them."

This amplification of the ante-Nicene form is still

^x This canon is remarkable as proving that "the Lord's Supper" was not then the appellation of the Eucharist, (A.D. 418,) but of an annual love-feast held on the anniversary of the Institution—"the same night in which He was betrayed." The Eucharist appears to have been generally celebrated with such a common meal in the earliest ages; and the phrase "Lord's Supper" in 1 Cor. xi. 20, probably indicates the whole feast rather than the Eucharistic celebration itself. Maldonatus (on Matt. xxvi. 26) is very severe on the "ignorance of Lutherans and Calvinists" in retaining this appellation, after the "supper" has disappeared; but it was a common usage with the Fathers, and is frequent in the Acts of the Council of Trent. The *Agape*, or love-feast, must have been discontinued when the Eucharist was celebrated early in the morning, which Cyprian attests to be the universal practice of his Church, (A.D. 250). The single exception allowed at Carthage for Maundy Thursday was prohibited by the Council in Trullo (can. xxix.), as peculiar to that Church, a profanation of Lent, and contrary to apostolical tradition.

wholly free from any idea of releasing souls out of *purgatory*. So, too, the prayer in S. Mark's Liturgy :—

“Give rest, O Lord our God, to the souls of our fathers and brethren who are departed in the faith of Christ. Be mindful of our forefathers from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets,” &c.

In this Liturgy it will be remembered that the Intercessions *precede* the oblation and consecration of the elements, whence that which was offered for the departed could only be the sacrifice of prayer.

S. Chrysostom's comes the nearest of any to the modern Mass, proceeding after the consecration :—

“We offer, moreover, this reasonable worship (*λαρpeῖαν*) for those who are departed from us in faith; our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, &c., and all other Thy saints, for the sake of whose prayers, O God, look upon us, and be mindful of those who rest in hope of a resurrection to eternal life; for the rest and forgiveness of the soul of Thy servant N—: Give it rest, O God, in a pleasant place, where there is no sorrow or mourning, but where it may rejoice in the light of Thy countenance.”

Still there is no trace of *purgatory*. The *latreia* is the whole service, at which the departed saints, like sick or absent brethren, are regarded as present in spirit; accordingly, prayer is made for their particular necessities, as for those of the living. They are supposed to rest in hope, and to intercede for the Church on earth, rather than to need the prayers of

† The *Ave Maria* introduced into these two Liturgies is manifestly a late interpolation.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 3.

the living for themselves. Such prayers are in fact a florid amplification of the Apostle's aspiration for his departed friend: "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day^a." They imply nothing like the obituary Mass.

This may be the place to notice the use of incense in the later Liturgies. The only mention of it in the ante-Nicene period is a passage at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth Apostolical Canon, permitting oil to be brought to the altar for the lamps, and "incense at the time of the oblation." The construction of the sentence savours strongly of an interpolation of later date^b; and this is confirmed by the profound silence of the earliest Liturgies. Incense is not mentioned by S. Clement, Justin Martyr, or in the Clementine Liturgy. In S. James it is found only in the *pro-anaphora* and post-communion portions, in connexion with the carrying in and out of the sacred elements. It has already been observed, that these portions of the service exhibit a much greater diversity than the *anaphora*, or "liturgy" strictly so-called. In S. Mark, incense is used both at the entrance of the holy things, and at the mention of the sacrifices of Abel and the patriarchs, in the commemoration of departed souls. In S. Chrysostom, as we might expect, the entrance is enriched with much additional ceremonial; not only the sacred vessels and the Gos-

^a 2 Tim. i. 18.

^b Sec p. 243. "The fourth and fifth canons (Latin text) are hardly more than explanations and commentaries on the third, and thus betray a more recent origin."—Hefele's "History of the Councils," Clarke's Translation, p. 459.

pel, but the holy Table, the priest, and the sanctuary are censed in the *pro-anaphora*. In the *anaphora* itself, it occurs only in censing the altar at the name of the Blessed Virgin (which is certainly a later interpolation), and in the commemoration of the departed. In none of the Liturgies is incense brought to the altar "at the time of the oblation," as supposed in the interpolated clause of the Apostolical Canon.

These facts must be allowed to confirm Dodwell's conclusion, that incense was unknown in the earliest offices of the Church. If it had formed a part of her liturgical inheritance from the Temple, the early Fathers could not have so invariably explained it as a *type* of the evangelical prayer which purifies the Christian sacrifice, and wafts it to the heavenly altar. Indeed, Tertullian seems to deny its use in the African Church^c, and Arnobius inveighs against it as a novelty unknown to Greeks and Romans in the heroic ages^d. There is no question that it was of ancient observance in the Temple rites of the East, especially in Egypt: and it is probable that it was first copied in the Alexandrian Liturgy. A more general and defined observance might be expected, if the use had been derived from the symbolism of the apocalyptic worship.

In any case, it has no bearing on the doctrine of the sacramental Presence, since the perfume was mostly directed to the Gospels, the altar vessels, and the *unconsecrated* elements. In later times, the elements were carried in and out of the church with great pomp, and "the imposing ceremony" of the great entrance has been referred to as a proof of the higher adoration

^c Apol., 30 and 42. App. No. 3.

^d Adv. Gent., vii. 26. *Ibid.*

paid after consecration^e. But the antiquity of this ceremonial is more than doubtful, and the proof, so far as it goes, is that no religious worship was intended in those Oriental prostrations. The same conclusion would follow in the case of incense; and it is confirmed by the marked absence of any such gestures at and after the consecration, as modern advocates of "adoration" deem to be due.

* Dr. Neale, "Liturgies Translated" (1859), p. 10 n.

CHAPTER X.

THE WESTERN LITURGIES.

THE liturgical remains of the West are naturally inferior to those of the East, the birth-place of both Jewish and Christian ritual, and for some centuries the home of evangelical literature. The language of the Roman Church in the time of Clement, and perhaps of Justin Martyr, was Greek; and the same is true of the Christians in the south of France, in the time of Irenæus^a. These Churches supplied the two parent Liturgies of the West; the Roman dignified with the name of S. Peter, and the Gallican derived probably from Ephesus, and traditionally connected with S. John. It seems probable that both forms originally followed the Greek use in the oblation and consecration of the Eucharist.

The invocation of the Holy Ghost was in the old African rite, which Sir W. Palmer supposes to be ori-

* "In some considerable (it cannot but be an undefinable) part of the three first centuries, the Church of Rome and most, if not all, the Churches of the West were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek, and many vestiges and traditions shew that their ritual, their liturgy was Greek. . . . So was it, too, in Gaul: there the first Christians were settled chiefly in the Greek cities. . . . Irenæus wrote in Greek; the account of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne is in Greek. Vestiges of the old Greek ritual long survived not only in Rome, but also in some of the Gallic Churches. The *Kyrie Eleison* still lingers in the Latin service."—Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book i. chap. i.

ginally the same with the Roman^b, and in the Liturgy of Milan, to which he ascribes the same parentage^c. The latter is without *the second oblation after consecration*, which has been in the Roman canon from the time of Gelasius (A.D. 492)^d. Both these Liturgies agree with the Roman in placing the kiss of peace at the end of the consecration, whereas the Oriental use (as we have seen) was to give it before the offertory. The Gallican still agrees in this and other *criteria* with the Oriental, and is traced directly to the East through Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp, who was metropolitan, or perhaps sole bishop, of Gaul towards the close of the second century. This was the parent of the Mozarabic rite, still preserved in Spain, and closely following the Oriental Liturgies in every important respect. The British and Irish rites were also Gallican, whence the tradition of these Churches ascribed their usages to S. John.

The divergency of these rites from the Roman, in the time of Gregory the Great, is shewn by the question addressed to him by Augustine, for his own guidance in England: "Why, when there is but one faith, there should be a different use in the Mass in the Roman and Gallican Churches?" and the Pope's reply,

^b Palmer's Dissertation, s. viii.: "quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus."—*Optat. cont. Parm.*, vi. iii., &c.

^c Ib., s. vii. See also Pfaff, *Diss. de Cons. Vet. Euch.*, s. vi.: "Descendat etiam, Domine, illa Spiritûs S. tui invisibilis forma et incomprehensibilis majestas, sicut quondam in patrum hostias descendebat, qui et oblationes nostras corpus et sanguinem tuum efficiat."—*Miss. Amb. Fer. vi.*

^d Some call this the *third* oblation, accounting the lay-offering the first.

advising him to select what was best out of either, equally attests the absence of the later craving to reduce all to the model of Rome.

The existing Roman Missal is derived from the Sacramentary of Gregory, who compiled it (at least in part) from a "scholasticus," but of what age, and whether Greek or Latin, cannot be determined. A similar work was put out by Gelasius (A.D. 492); and Leo (A.D. 451) is said to have introduced the words, "sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam." The evidence goes no further; but Sir W. Palmer is disposed to believe that the *canon* is still substantially the same as at the beginning of the fifth century, when it was esteemed to be of apostolical antiquity. Still he shews that even this had departed from the type preserved in the African and Ambrosian rites, and there is reason to think that all originally came from the Greek^e.

The text of Gregory himself is very uncertain. So many alterations had been introduced by the time of Charlemagne, that Alcuin could only distinguish them by conjecture; and Du Pin confesses it to be "certain that none of the present editions give the Sacramentary in its purity, but with many corruptions^f." In the Council of Trent the Roman Missal was openly charged with variations so considerable, that if the Mozarabic rite were celebrated in Italy it would not be recognised for the Mass. The Milan Liturgy was affirmed to be very different from the Roman as then used, and the true Roman office, three hundred years

^e *Origines Liturgicæ*, sect. vi.
p. 133.

^f Bib. Cen. vi., *apud* Brett,

older, was said to be still retained by the Dominican Order^g.

Our own Dean Field has proved at length that the Mass, as it was generally celebrated in the West before the time of Luther, resembled the Anglican more than the modern Liturgy imposed from Rome since the Council of Trent^h. All the efforts of the supreme pontiff have not been able to stamp out all traces of this earlier independent testimony. It is only within a year or two that the Use of Paris was superseded by the Roman, to the deep regret of the more learned French Catholicsⁱ.

The Roman Missal as now published, begins the Ordinary of the Mass with a preparatory Psalm and Confession: then come the Introit, Kyrie Eleison, and the Gloria in Excelsis, followed by the Nicene Creed. The elements are then severally presented by the priest, here assuming the ancient privilege of the people. In like manner he presents the incense, with which the altar is occasionally fumigated: then, after the twenty-fifth Psalm, an oblation of the elements is made by the priest, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, as the present Office adds,—

“In honour of the blessed Mary ever-Virgin, of blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints, that it may be available to their honour and

^g P. Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, VI., xlv.

^h “Of the Church,” App. to Book III.

ⁱ One of whom was good enough to present me with his copy of the *Euclologe, ou Livre de l'Eglise à l'usage de Paris*. Published, by order of the archbishop, by the *Libraires Associés pour les usages du Diocèse*, 1827.

to our salvation, and that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven."

This incongruous addition has been interpolated since the date of the old Liturgy of S. Peter, where the prayer of prothesis was simply,—

"Look upon us and upon this bread and cup, and make it Thy unspotted Body and precious Blood, to the communion of our souls and bodies."

The Preface, the Vere dignum, and the Ter Sanctus, complete the "Ordinary" of the Mass.

Then follows the *Canon*, in these words ^k:—

"We therefore humbly pray and beseech Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy unspotted sacrifices, which in the first place we offer Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, to which vouchsafe to grant peace, as also to preserve, unite, and govern it throughout the world; together with Thy servant N. our Pope, N. our Bishop, as also all orthodox believers and professors of the Catholic and Apostolic faith.

"Commemoration of the Living:—

"Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants, men and women, N. and N., and of all here present, whose faith and devotion are known unto Thee, for whom we offer, or who offer up to Thee, this sacrifice of praise for themselves, their families, and friends, for the redemption of their souls, for the health

^k "The Missal for the Laity," published by authority, A.D. 1845, at Derby, London, and Dublin. The rubrics to which an asterisk is prefixed are wanting in the *Eucologe à l'usage de Paris*, published at Paris, 1827.

and salvation they hope for, and for which they now pay their vows to Thee, the eternal, living, and true God.

* “*Infra actionem* :—

“Communicating with, and honouring, in the first place, the memory of the ever-glorious Virgin Mary, mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ; as also of the blessed apostles and martyrs, Peter and Paul, &c., and of all Thy saints, through whose merits and prayers grant that we may be always defended by the help of Thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord.

* “*Spreading his hands over the oblation, he says* :—

“We therefore beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this oblation of our servitude, as also of Thy whole family; [and to dispose our days in Thy peace, to preserve us from eternal damnation, and rank us in the number of Thine elect.]” Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all respects to bless, approve, ratify, and accept; that it may be made to us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Who the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with eyes lifted up towards heaven to Thee, Almighty God, His Father, giving thanks to Thee, He blessed, brake, and gave to His disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of this: **FOR THIS IS MY BODY.**

* “*Kneeling the priest adores, and then elevates the sacred Host.*

“In like manner after He had supped, taking also this excellent chalice into His holy and venerable hands, giving Thee also thanks, He blessed, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take and drink ye all of this:—

“**FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW**

” Introduced by Gregory the Great, A.D. 592. *Wendover.*

AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH: WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU, AND FOR MANY, UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.

“As often as ye do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me^a.

*“ *Here also kneeling, he elevates the chalice.*

“Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of the same Christ, Thy Son our Lord, His resurrection from the dead and admirable ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure Host, a holy Host, an unspotted Host, the holy bread of eternal life, and chalice of everlasting salvation. Upon which vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as Thou wert graciously pleased to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high-priest Melchisedek offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice and unspotted victim^o.

“We most humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy divine

^a It is remarkable that the Roman Church, which alone attaches such tremendous power to the words of Institution, is more incorrect than any other in reciting them. She cuts short the blessing the bread at the five words of S. Matthew, omitting the important additions of S. Luke and S. Paul. At the same time, while enlarging the blessing of the cup with words and phrases not in either evangelist or apostle, she removes the emphatic *Bibito ex eo omnes*. Lastly, with some of the heretical forms of the East, she mistranslates the participle by the *future*, “which *shall be shed*,” and loses sight of the command to keep the *Anamnesis*.

^o These last words were added by Leo I., and the whole of this oblation after consecration is absent from the Ambrosian Canon, which represents the old Latin rite.

Majesty; that as many as shall partake of the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son at this altar, may be filled with every heavenly grace and blessing. Through the same Christ our Lord."

Next follows the Commemoration of the Dead, ending with the Lord's Prayer. Then the *commixtion*, or union, in which the words are:—

"May this mixture and consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be, *to us that receive it*, effectual to eternal life."

After the *Agnus Dei*, and a few prayers, the priest receives the sacrament in both kinds^p, with the words:—

"The Body (or the Blood) preserve my soul unto eternal life."

It will be observed that the words *given* and *shed*, denoting the *slain* Lamb, are omitted; and the benefit is to the *soul* alone, without mention of the body. At this place the English edition has the rubric:—

"*Here the Holy Communion is administered, if there are any persons to receive. The acolyte spreads a cloth before them, and says the confiteor.*"

The Paris Missal makes no reference to the communion of the people. When administered, it is given

^p In the Missal as printed at Rome, 1647, (Brett,) the priest is directed to "take all the Blood with the small piece (of bread) put into it;" but in the "Missal for the Laity," as published in England, he receives both kinds *separately*. Several rubrics for adoration, secret consecration, &c., are also in the Roman form, and not in the English.

in one kind, which the priest places in the mouth of the communicant¹.

In comparing this Office with the Eastern Liturgies, we are at once struck by the fact, that not even the present Roman Canon affects to offer that sacrifice of Christ, or of His Body and Blood, which is enunciated in the Tridentine decree. Neither is there one word, from beginning to end, which expresses or implies the tenet of transubstantiation. In fact, corrupt as the Missal undoubtedly is, it is easier to reconcile its teaching with our own Twenty-eighth and Thirty-first Articles, than with the decrees of the Council of Trent.

The leading peculiarity of the Roman Canon is the *double oblation* of the elements, before and after consecration. If the first represent the sacrificial oblation of the Eastern Church, to which it bears a strong resemblance, the other must be a corrupt addition of later times². In neither, however, are the *oblata* designated as Christ, or as His Body and Blood. They are plainly bread and wine.

The modern Church of Rome regards the second oblation as the true sacrifice, and the first as an amplification of the prayer of prothesis. It is observable, however, that it is the first oblation *alone* which mentions the Body and Blood of Christ, and the

¹ Bishops and priests receive in both kinds, but they seldom present themselves, because all are bound to celebrate daily, and it is against the rule to communicate twice. At an ordination which I witnessed lately in Mainz Cathedral, the newly-ordained priests received in both kinds, over a white cloth extended between two acolytes in front of the altar.

² In fact, this second oblation after consecration is not found in the Ambrosian Canon, which represents the old Latin rite.

petition to make the bread and wine the Body and Blood *to us* (*ut fiat nobis*) plainly refers to their *reception* in the Communion. This petition, uttered before consecration, cannot to the Romanists themselves imply the sacramental conversion which they call transubstantiation. In the second oblation the thing offered is "the host," which, though by the Council of Trent identified with Christ Himself, clearly means in the Canon nothing but bread. The epithets ascribed to it are all taken from the Greek, where they are used of the unconsecrated elements, and the prayer that God would command these things to be carried by the hands of His holy angel to the altar on high, is clearly inapplicable to the Body of Christ. The same petition is found in the Clementine Liturgy, only in place of the angelic ministry it runs, "by the mediation of Thy Christ,"—a conclusive proof that the *oblatus* itself was not Christ.

Assuming this second oblation of the Roman Canon to be the sacrificial one, the Office will be found to be adapted from the Greek type, *omitting the Invocation of the Holy Ghost*. This will be apparent to any one who will insert the Invocation, from one of those Liturgies, between the oblation and the petition for the gifts to be carried to the heavenly altar. With this addition, the Institution, Oblation, and Benediction would come in their usual Greek order.

On the omission of this important feature from the Latin version, Gregory himself seems to have supplied some explanation*. Referring to a tradition, extant in his time, that the apostles consecrated by the Lord's

* Ep. vii. 63.

Prayer alone, he expresses his dislike at the custom in the Oriental Liturgies of interposing other prayers between the consecration and this divine formula. Hence he directed it to be said immediately after the consecration prayer, *super oblationem*. His words are:—

“Orationem vero Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo Orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent. Et valde mihi inconueniens visum est ut precem, quam Scholasticus composuerat, super oblationem diceremus, et ipsam orationem, quam Redemptor noster composuit, super ejus Corpus et Sanguinem taceremus †.”

Now we learn from S. Augustine that in his time the Lord's Prayer *concluded* the Consecration ^a, where we still find it in the Greek Liturgies, following the Invocation or Benediction. By bringing it immediately after the oblation, in which the words of Institution are recited, Gregory, in fact, *expunged* the Invocation as superfluous. This is confirmed by another remark of S. Augustine, to the effect that the prayers of oblation were called *precationes*, while those by which the gifts were blessed and sanctified, were termed *orationes*. Gregory's *precem* is the same with S. Augustine's *precationes*, and what he did was to substitute the *Dominica Oratio* for the *orationes* of human composition. Two important results follow: 1. that all which now intervenes in the Canon between the words of Institution and the Lord's Prayer, that is to say, *the second oblation and the commemoration of the dead*,

† Ep. vii. 64.

^a “Totam petitionem, qua illud quod est in Domini mensa benedicitur et sanctificatur, fere omnis Ecclesia Oratione concludit.”—*Ep. ad Paul.*

have been interpolated since Gregory ; and 2. that the same character attaches to the prayers between the Lord's Prayer and the Communion, since Gregory's Canon, like the ancient one, *ended* with the Lord's Prayer, and was immediately followed by the Communion ^x.

If the present Canon were subjected to the corrections thus suggested, it would become a somewhat poor and tumid version of the Greek Liturgies. As it stands, it is singularly *perplexed*, both in structure and expression ; enunciating, in fact, neither the primitive nor the Tridentine sacrifice. The elements are never said to *be* the Body and Blood, save in the Communion ; there is only a petition to make them so "*unto us*," and that *before* the words of Institution by which the conversion is supposed to be effected. Nowhere in the Canon of the Mass is there any oblation of Christ, or of His Body and Blood^y. It requires the dogma of consecration by the words of Institution (which Gregory the Great did not hold) to produce an oblation of consecrated things at all. Even then the further dogma of transubstantiation must be interpolated, before there is any glimpse of "a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine." On this prodigious miracle the Canon of the Mass is profoundly silent.

^x Brett's Dissert., p. 280, where is a citation from the Antididagma of the Cologne Chapter against the reforms of their Archbishop Herman, shewing that the Canon formerly ended with the Lord's Prayer, and the remainder was an *embolismum seu excrescentiam*. Note also Augustine's "concludit" in the previous note.

^y It is observable that Gregory, like the Fathers, applied these designations to the *unconsecrated* elements.

On the supposition that this Office was originally taken from the Greek, its peculiar structure may perhaps be due to the liberty of thought necessarily exercised in a translation. The Latin compiler found the recital of the words of Institution fixed, invariable, and apostolical; the Invocation was subject to alteration by authority of the Church. The first retained the Saviour's own words; the other was the composition of men. Moreover, it was the words of Institution which gave the symbolical character to the elements, and so far constituted the sacrament, or visible sign, of the unseen realities to be imparted to the receiver. Hence Augustine's words, "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum²." In this symbolical character the Gifts were offered to God. The further blessing had respect to the *communion* more than the *sacrifice*. The Spirit whom the Greeks invoked on the elements was to find His true tabernacle in the worthy communicant. The consummation of the rite lay in the communion of Christ with His ransomed people, through their participation of the sacrifice accepted of His Father. To this end it would be apparent that His original words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," were of perpetual efficacy; in repeating them over the elements with thanksgiving and prayer, it could not be *essential* to add a form of benediction, neither delivered in Holy Scripture, nor received by invariable tradition. Hence Gregory chose to replace the Invocation by the Lord's

² In Joh., lxxx. 15. De Catacl., c. iii. It should be borne in mind that this often-repeated dogma is by Augustine enunciated of *Baptism*, not of the Eucharist.

Prayer, in which the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," was often applied to the Eucharist.

Even among the strenuous adherents of the Greek Use we find the sacramental virtue attributed at one time to the words of Institution, and at another to the Invocation. Gregory Nazianzen^a and Epiphanius^b assert the former, Ephrem Syrus^c and Theophilus^d the latter; while Gregory Nyssen^e, Chrysostom^f, and the Sermons attributed to Eusebius Emissenus^g, are cited on both sides. The practical conclusion is that *both* were included in the true idea of consecration. In his sermon on the treason of Judas, Chrysostom finely says:—

"It is not man who makes the gifts to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but the same who was crucified, even Christ. The priest stands, executing the form, and pronouncing the words, 'this is My Body;' but the grace and power which works the whole is of God. And as that voice which said, 'increase and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was spoken indeed once, but works through all time, by empowering our nature to produce offspring, so also the same voice once uttered by that Divine Tongue, 'this is My Body,' works as the power of the Word on every table, in all His churches, to this day and till His future appearing, to perfect the sacrifice^h."

The original consecration resides in the words and

^a Greg. Naz., Orat. ii. de Pasch.

^b Epiph. in Ancorat.

^c Ephrem Syr. *περὶ ἑρπυσίου*.

^d Theophil. Alex., Ep. i.

^e Greg. Nyss., Orat. in Bapt. Xti. Compare Orat. Cat., ii. 37.

^f Chrys., De Sac. vi. Compare Hom. i. in Matt., and Hom. ii. in 2 Tim.

^g Serm. v. de Pasch. Compare Serm. de Corp. et Sang. Dom.

^h Hom. de Prod. Jud. i. 6.

promise of Christ ; they are recited to apply them to the particular sacrament, which is thus perfected, or consecrated to be the instrument of the spiritual grace. A similar argument was used by two of the Greek prelates at the Council of Florence :—

“Even as that divine precept once spoken by God, ‘let the earth bring forth grass, and the herb yielding seed, according to its kind,’ works from the beginning until now, and will work to the end ; and yet we believe that, while it is the Divine precept which empowers the earth to produce and bear fruit, there is need also of the husbandman’s energy, for we always see it co-working in the earth to the produce ; so also we say of the Holy Sacrifice, that it is those words (of the original Institution) which sanctify it ; but there are conjoined moreover the prayers and invocations of the priest to perfect the consecration, like the care of the husbandman to the fruit of the earth. In thus saying, we Greeks do not rely on ourselves, but look to the tenor of what is written in the sacred liturgies. Much more ought not the Latins to consider only their own prejudices¹.”

This is precisely the view taken in our own Baptismal Office of the consecration of the water. First we recite the Lord’s baptism in the river Jordan, as sanctifying the whole element of water to the mystical washing away of sin ; and then we pray for the sanctification of that particular water to the same use, that “the child now to be baptized therein may receive the fulness of grace.”

These considerations go to justify the early Western view of consecration by the words of Institution,

¹ Syropulus, Hist. Conc. Flor., i. 1.

coupled with prayer, independently of the special benediction customary in the East^k.

A widely different notion arose in the dark age that descended on the West, after it fell under the barbarian yoke. The mere pronounciation of the mystic words by a priest was then thought to fix the Divine Presence in the material element, irrespectively of prayer, or after use in communion. The gifts exhibited in the sacrament were mistaken for the Person of the Giver. It was no longer the *crucified* Body and *outshed* Blood, to be received in a mystery, but the *glorified* Christ in bodily presence, that filled the paten and the chalice. The gifts which He bestowed in two separate elements, to symbolize His Body and Blood sundered in death, were daringly brought together, first in actual mixture, then by the school dogma of concomitance, and finally by suppressing the cup. "Whole Christ" was now lodged in the bread; that inward and spiritual Presence of the living Redeemer, which He taught us to expect as the result of feeding on His sacramental Body and Blood, was transferred, from its proper tabernacle in the soul, to the material symbols of His Death. This so confounded the sacramental mystery, that the schoolmen, who had wrought the mischief, were driven to the invention of transub-

^k Archdeacon Freeman has abundantly proved, in his "Principles of Divine Service," that consecration, in the primitive idea, was due to the entire Eucharistic prayer and action. This would render the *order* of its several parts of less moment than it afterwards became, when the Greeks restrained consecration to the Invocation, and the Latins to the Institution. It is by no means improbable that the words of Institution *always* stood in the West at the close of the Consecratory prayer, and thence arose the notion that their pronounciation effected the consecration.

stantiation, as the only logical loop-hole from despair. And so He whom, S. Peter taught, "the heaven of heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things," was feigned to be brought down at the bidding of every priest, not to feed the hungry soul, but to be lifted up, or put down, upon altars without communicants; to be gazed at, or shut up in pyxes; to be carried about in processions without His will or consent; to be exposed for adoration by those who worship they know not what; to be made a hostage for the observance of unjust contracts; to leud His life-giving Blood to the pen of the diplomatist, or even—*horribile dictu*—to the infernal malice of the poisoner!

These awful profanations, with other consequences revolting alike to decency, morality, and religion, were the offspring of the deplorable superstition, which converted the sacrament of our Lord's crucified Body and Blood into the reality of His glorified Person.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FATHERS.

IN this chapter, the testimony of the Catholic Liturgies is to be corroborated from the remains of the contemporaneous Fathers. These are sometimes referred to as infallible oracles, whose lightest word is to silence all dispute. Others discard them as private individuals, of no greater weight than modern theologians. Controversialists have had recourse to them, as children rush to a heap of stones, in quest of a missile to throw at an opponent's head. They pelt one another with Fathers, without dreaming of accepting their authority against themselves. The Romanist overrules all by the authority of the Papal See, the ultra-Protestant by his private interpretation of Holy Scripture ; each finds enough to sustain his own predetermined view, while neither can deprive his adversary of the same advantage.

It is evident that no great question can or ought to be decided by a mere *Catena* of Fathers. It is easy to construct one on any side, by omitting all that makes against it. Every Father is not always in agreement with every other, nor every one invariably consistent with himself. They expressed their conscientious convictions of the truth as revealed in Holy Scripture, and taught by the Catholic Church ; but not being inspired, they are no infallible guides on either point. Knowing, many of them, no other lan-

guage than their own, their expositions of Scripture may be corrected by the better criticism of later times. Their great value is as *witnesses* to the interpretation and teaching of the Church in their own day. This is a matter of *fact* on which they could not be mistaken; and to know how the Scriptures were understood in the earliest ages, is our surest guide to the original and genuine interpretation. This evidence, however, like that of the Liturgies, manifestly depends on the *consent* and *antiquity* of the witnesses adduced. One or two writers will not establish a Church doctrine in the third or fourth century, any more than in the sixteenth or seventeenth. Nor is it possible to set up Catholic consent, on evidence of the sixth or seventh centuries, to propositions unknown in the second and third.

When the Church of England appeals "to the old godly doctors of the most uncorrupt ages," she waives neither the supremacy of Scripture, nor her own authority as witness and keeper of Holy Writ. She does not propound the Fathers as an immediate authority to her children, much less erect them into a court of appeal from her own sentence. She only challenges a comparison of her doctrine with that of the primitive Churches, shewing that in all the great questions at issue between Rome and herself, the Fathers are on her side, more than her adversary's. She cites them to prove that in the primitive Churches Holy Scripture was the supreme rule of faith, that the several Churches interpreted it with equal and independent authority, that each decreed its own rites and ceremonies, and that the Catholic agreement subsisting between all is

retained, in all things necessary or important, in her own doctrine and discipline. This is all that is requisite to establish her claim as a living branch of the Holy Catholic Church: and that claim once established, her voice, and *hers only*, is the voice of the Church to her loyal children. For a Churchman to bring up the Fathers again, is as irrelevant as for the dissenter to press us with his view of the Scripture. It is arguing over again, on private judgment, the evidence already heard and decided upon by the Church.

In the present day we have the advantage of better and more authentic texts than were open to the Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but there is little to be added to the evidence collected in such works as Jewell's Apology, or Bishop Patrick's "Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church^a." It has, of course, not convinced, and never will convince, the Tridentines: neither will they ever be able to refute it. If the mine of antiquity is to be worked again, it would be but fair to specify the mistake or new evidence relied upon, instead of involving the unwary in a cloud of "godly doctors" from whom nothing is distinctly produced.

One reason which makes the testimony of the Fathers less conclusive than might be expected, is that they wrote before much controversy had arisen on the Eucharistic doctrine. This is, doubtless, the condition most favourable to piety and devotion: but it fails to promote exactness of thought or language. Men do not begin to weigh their expressions, or even

^a Gibson's "Preservative against Popery." Tit. vii. c. 4.

to analyze their conceptions, till they feel the danger of being misunderstood. A problem of any kind can hardly be thought out without the stimulus of collision with other views; on the mysteries of religion, few are even now able to express their belief with verbal accuracy, after ages of controversy and definition. Men of exact habits of thought constantly complain of want of clearness in the discourses of well-educated preachers. Why should we expect more from the Fathers, whose circumstances would suggest so much less? Their testimony is sufficient, if we do not press them beyond their knowledge; it fails only when we try to wrest it to support conclusions which they never thought of.

In the following citations much, of course, is lost by translation; the liturgical references in particular are far clearer in the original language, where the very words of the Liturgies constantly recur, to determine the sacrificial meaning of the author.

Clement of Rome, treating of the conduct of Divine Service, probably in the life-time of the Apostles, says:—

“We ought to do all which the Lord has prescribed in due order. He has enjoined the oblations and the liturgies to be celebrated^b at the appointed times, not thoughtlessly and irregularly, but at fixed hours and seasons. Where, and by whom He will have them celebrated, He has Himself appointed by His sovereign will; that all things being done holily in His good pleasure may be acceptable to His will. Those, therefore, who make their oblations at the prescribed

^b προσφορὰς, λειτουργίας, ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, are all liturgical terms.

times are accepted and blessed, for following the law of the Lord they do not err^c."

This is not only proof of the use of a Liturgy in the Apostolic age, but the Christian Liturgy is paralleled with the Jewish. The author goes on to adduce the several offices assigned in the Levitical Liturgy to the high priest, the priests, and the Levites, "while the layman was bound by the lay regulations:"—

"Even so let every one of you, brethren, give thanks to God (*make his eucharist*^d) in his own order, abiding in good conscience, not transgressing the prescribed rule of his ministry (*the canon of his liturgy*^e) in all gravity. Not everywhere are the daily sacrifices offered, or the peace-offerings^f, or sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem alone. And even there they are not offered in any place, but upon the altar in front of the sanctuary, the offering being first examined by the high-priest and the aforesaid ministers. They, therefore, who offer anything contrary to His will, incur the pain of death."

After observing that the greater the knowledge vouchsafed to Christians, the greater also is the responsibility, Clement comes to the object of his argument, which was to reinstate the ministers ejected at Corinth:—

"The apostles" (he says) "were sent by Christ, and Christ from God, in an orderly way. They in like manner

^c 1st Ep. Cor., cap. xl. (App. No. 2.) The date of this epistle depends on the order of the author's succession to the episcopate. Some put it as early as 68—70, but Westcott prefers the later date of *circ.* 95.

^d εὐχαριστεῖτω.

^e τὸν ὁρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα.

^f εὐχῶν, not the usual word, but used apparently in this sense in Lev. xxii. 29.

appointed bishops and deacons according to the Scripture^s." Referring to the contentions for the priesthood against Aaron, he says, "The apostles foresaw a similar strife for the right to the episcopate, and gave instructions to continue the succession; consequently those appointed by them or other rulers with consent of the Church could not be justly dismissed without cause. For our sin will not be small if we cast out of the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily presented the gifts^h."

Throughout this argument Clement insists on the parallel between the high-priest, priests, Levites, and people of the then existing temple at Jerusalem, and the apostles, bishops, deacons, and laity of the Christian Church. The point of correspondence is in the *offerings* presented by each. The Jewish sacrifices are paralleled by the Christian oblations, the presenting of which is the special office of the bishops and deacons. He uses the same Greek words that we find in the Liturgies, thereby confirming the existence of a very similar Liturgy in the apostles' age. In fact, it was probably these very references which gave rise to the belief that Clement was the author of the Liturgy found in the Constitutions; since it has no historical connexion with the Church over which he presided.

^s Citing Isaiah lx. 17, Sept.

^h Cap. xliii., xlii. On the liturgical words here employed, it has been suggested that *προσφορὰ* and *λειτουργίας* were offered by the whole congregation; *δῶρα*, the eucharistical elements, by the bishop or presbyter alone, (Drake's "Teaching of the Church during the First Three Centuries," p. 14.) That is, the celebrant offered them in right of the Apostolic Commission, and not *simply* as representing the people. Yet, as the gifts were clearly brought by the people, and the priest officiated on their behalf, and spoke in their name, they, too, were "sacrificers."

It will be observed that Clement attributes these oblations and liturgies to the ordinance of Christ: the same thing is said in the Liturgy which bears his name, and by many of the Fathers. The text commonly adduced in support of this belief is Matt. v. 23, 24, interpreted of the first-fruits and other contributions for the support of the clergy, out of which the celebrant selected the bread and wine for the sacrament. Our Lord's action in blessing the elements at the Institution was regarded as an oblation, acknowledging God's universal sovereignty, and symbolizing the approaching sacrifice of Himself. Hence it was held to be part of the ordinance which He gave to His Church; this language of the earliest Liturgy is corroborated by Clement, who was a fellow-labourer with the Apostles.

Ignatius, another contemporary of the Apostles, says:—

“If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of Godⁱ.” He exhorts the Churches to cherish the unity of which the Eucharist was the seal, “breaking one and the same bread, the medicine of immortality^j.” “Take heed to have but one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the unity of His Blood, one altar, as there is one bishop together with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow-servants^k.” He complains of those who abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, as not “confessing the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which (flesh) suffered for our sins, which the Father graciously raised up. They who speak against this gift of God, will die in their contradiction; it were better to love it, that they may rise again^l.”

ⁱ Eph., cap. v. (App. No. 2.)

^j Ibid., xx.

^k Philad., iv.

^l Smyrn., vii.

The phrase "within the altar," is thus repeated in another epistle :—

"He that is within the altar is clean [but he that is without is not clean], that is, he who does anything apart from the bishop, presbyter, and deacon, is not clean in his conscience ^m."

This repeated mention of the altar in reference to the Eucharist, when taken in connexion with the oblations spoken of by S. Clement, cannot be easily interpreted as a metaphorical expression. Ignatius plainly meant what we ourselves should mean by "communicating with the altar," i.e. receiving the sacrament from the ministry rightfully officiating at the holy table, or altar ⁿ.

Justin Martyr's description of the Eucharistic celebration has been given in a previous chapter ^o. In his dialogue with Trypho he alleges the offering of fine flour for the leper ^p, to be—

"a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed in remembrance of

^m Ad Trall., cap. vii. The words in brackets are added from the ancient Latin version.

ⁿ The whole testimony of S. Ignatius is wanting in the Syriac version of his Epistles, recently discovered in the monastery of S. Mary, in the desert of Nitria. This Version is limited to the three epistles to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans, none of which contain any allusion to the Eucharist. If this version is to supersede the shorter Greek recension hitherto almost universally accepted since Bishop Pearson's Vindication—a position by no means yet established—S. Clement will be the only Apostolic Father left to refer in any way to the Holy Eucharist, since it is not mentioned in the Epistles of Polycarp, Barnabas, or the unknown writer to Diognetus, nor, which is more surprising, in the Pastor of Hermas. ^o See p. 258. ^p Lev. xiv. 10, 20.

the suffering He endured on behalf of the souls to be purified from sin, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world with all things therein for the sake of man¹." To this rite he refers the prophecy of Malachi, affirming, (as in S. Mark's Liturgy,) that the bread and cup of the Eucharist are the pure sacrifice by which the Gentiles glorify His Name, while the Jews profane it. Quoting the prophets at some length against the Judaical notion of a value in the external services, he repeats that God needs nothing, but has appointed all for the benefit of man. Having cited the fiftieth Psalm in the Septuagint Version, he dwells on the concluding verse, "The sacrifice of praise shall glorify Me, and there is the way in which I shall shew him the salvation of God²;" a text often applied to the Eucharistic sacrifice, probably because "salvation" (*σωτήριον*) is the name which the Septuagint gives to the peace-offerings³. Justin argues that Christians are the true high-priestly race of God, because we know that God accepts sacrifice only through His priests⁴, and he adduces Mal. i. 10—12 as anticipating the sacrifices which Jesus Christ enjoined us to offer; i.e. the Eucharist of the bread and the cup which are offered by all Christians throughout the world; and God bears witness that they are acceptable to Him⁵. At the same time he insists that prayer and thanksgiving are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifice, and maintains that "these are truly offered by Christians only." [The material oblation is the visible exhibition of this inward spiritual sacrifice.]

The constant doctrine of this Father is that God has no need of sacrifice. He regards the Levitical sacrifices as a condescension to the weakness and hard-

¹ Dial. Tryph., (App. No 3,) cap. xli.

² Cap. xxii.

³ Exodus xx. 24; Lev. iii. 1.

⁴ Cap. cxvi.

⁵ Cap. cxvii.

ness of heart of the Jews, and the Gentile ones as altogether impious and demoniacal. He founds the Eucharistic oblation on an entirely new footing, foretold by Malachi and enjoined by Christ. It comprehends both a true sacrifice of praise and a remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) of the sufferings of Christ. This is a sacrifice of a wholly different kind from the Levitical or the Gentile. The oblation is of bread and wine, which in the Communion (as we have seen) are changed into the Flesh and Blood of the incarnate Jesus^v.

The same doctrine is more fully expressed by Irenæus (A.D. 182—8). He adduces the Eucharist as an unanswerable proof of the three great truths denied by the Gnostics: the unity of the Old and New Testaments, the Incarnation of Christ, and the resurrection of the body.

“He argues that the same God and the same religion are revealed under both dispensations, the difference being that the Law enjoins a servile and the Gospel a filial worship. He often repeats the maxim, that God has no need of sacrifices: it is man that desires to offer a gift, which God vouchsafes to accept as a proof of amity, that we may not think him inaccessible to our approach. He shews by a copious citation of the Psalms and Prophets, that the spiritual sacrifices of faith and charity were required under the Old Testament as much as the New, and without them no sacrifice of the altar was accepted. Christian sacrifices, he says, differ not in *genus*, but in *species*. The Incarnation he affirms to be a real and permanent union of the Divinity with human nature, whereby not the soul only, but the

^v See p. 260.

body of man is made capable of immortality; and this is shewn in the Eucharist, which unites our bodies with the Body of Christ, and hence is the food of immortality."

This is the argument of the fourth book of the great work against heresies. Summing up his citations from the Old Testament, he writes :—

"From all which it is manifest, that not sacrifices and holocausts were required of them by God, but faith, and obedience, and righteousness for their salvation. As in the prophet Hosea, God, teaching His will, said, 'I desire mercy rather than sacrifice, and the knowledge of God above burnt-offerings.' Our Lord also reminded them of the same, saying, 'If ye had known what this is, I desire mercy more than sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless;' bearing witness to the prophets, that they preached the truth, and convicting them (the Jews) of their own culpable folly. But giving counsel also to His own disciples to offer first-fruits of His creatures to God, not as though He needed anything, but that they themselves might be neither unfruitful nor ungrateful, He took bread, which is one of these creatures, and gave thanks, saying, This is My Body : in like manner, He confessed the Cup, which is of the same creation with us, to be His Blood, and so taught the New Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the world to God who supplies our aliment, as the first-fruits of His own gifts under the New Testament; which in the twelve prophets Malachi thus foreshewed (Mal. i. 10, 11), most evidently signifying by these words that the former people have indeed ceased to offer to God, but that still in every place sacrifice is offered to Him, and that a pure one, and His Name is glorified among the Gentiles w."

^w Adv. Hær., lib. iv., xvii., xviii., al. xxxii., xxxiii. (App. No. 3.)

After explaining that the Name is that of the Son, by whom the Father is glorified and man is glorified, he proceeds :—

“Since, then, the Name of the Son is the Name of the Father in the omnipotent Godhead, and the Church offers through Jesus Christ, he says well on both accounts*, ‘and in every place incense is offered to My Name and a pure sacrifice.’ Now the incense John in the Apocalypse declares to be the prayers of the saints; therefore the Church’s oblation, which the Lord taught her to offer throughout the world, is reputed a pure sacrifice with God, and is accepted of Him, not that He needs sacrifice from us, but because he who offers finds glory in his offering, when the gift is accepted. For by the gift to a king is shewn both honour and affection, which the Lord, desiring us to offer in all singleness and innocency, declared His pleasure, saying, ‘Therefore when thou offerest thy gift at the altar, and rememberest that thy brother hath somewhat against thee, leave thy gift before the altar, and go first be reconciled to thy brother, and then returning offer thy gift.’ We are bound, therefore, to offer the first-fruits of His creation to God, as Moses also says, ‘Thou shalt not appear in the presence of the Lord thy God empty :’ . . . not offering in general (*genus*) is rejected, for there were oblations then, and there are oblations now, sacrifices among the people and sacrifices in the Church;—but the kind only (*species*) is changed, because that now it is offered not by slaves, but by the free.”

It was the custom in the early Church to offer the first-fruits of the harvest, the vintage, and other produce, for the support of the clergy. These, with

* *Secundum utraque* may mean either “on both grounds,” viz. that the Name of the Son belongs to the Father, and that the Church offers through the Son; or (which I prefer) “according to both kinds of offering,” viz. the incense and the mincha—the prayers and the sacrament.

† Ibid.

other contributions for pious uses, were brought to the church to be dedicated and blessed before they were distributed: and no such offerings might be sold by the presbyters^a. The third Apostolic canon directs that of these offerings nothing shall be brought *to the altar* "beyond the ordinance of the Lord for the sacrifice, neither honey nor milk, nor made liquors instead of wine, nor birds, nor animals, nor pulse." An exception is allowed for ears of new corn and grapes, at the proper season, to which an interpolation of after times adds, "oil for the lamps and incense," supposed to have been used in embalming the dead^a. All other lay-offerings were carried to the bishop's house; but not presented on the altar. It would appear that from the bread and wine brought to the altar the celebrant selected a portion for the Eucharistic Oblation, and this Irenæus designates by the name of *Primitiæ*, (whether strictly so or not,) as being the choice or most precious fruits of nature, and therefore fittest to be symbols of His Body and Blood, Who is "the first-fruits of them that slept."

Referring to Phil. iv. 18,—a text applied to the Eucharist in all the Liturgies,—he contends that

"the Church, and the Church alone, offers this pure sacrifice to the Creator in offering His creatures with thanksgiving. The Jews do not offer it, because their hands are full of blood, and they have not received the Word by which the oblation is made^b. Neither do the heretics offer rightly, alleging the Father to be another than the Creator. . . . How can they confess the bread over which thanks are given, to be the Body of their Lord, and the cup His Blood,

^a Con. Anc., can. xv.

^a See p. 243.

^b The words of Institution and Consecration.

while they say He is not the very Son of the Maker of the world, that is His Word, by whom the tree is made fruitful, and the fountains flow, who gives first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear? or how do they say again that the flesh returns to corruption, and is incapable of life, which is fed by the Body and Blood of the Lord? Either let them change their opinion, or abstain from offering what has been said. But our judgment is conformable to the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn confirms our judgment. For we offer unto Him His own, fitly affirming the communion and unity of flesh and spirit; for as the bread which is of the earth, receiving the Invocation of God, is now no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly; so our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible (i.e. bound under corruption), but have hope of the resurrection to eternal life *."

These passages plainly refer to the Eucharistic Liturgy;—to the oblatory words, "of Thine own we offer unto Thee," and the Invocation^d by which the offering was made the Body and Blood. In like manner, when contending in another place for the resurrection of the body, Irenæus asks how it can be denied that our flesh is capable of the gift of eternal life,—

"when the mixed cup and made bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist becomes Christ's Body [and Blood], and by these the substance of our flesh is increased *."

* Adv. Hær. IV. xviii. 4, 5. (xxxii.) (App. No. 3.)

^d It has been suggested that *ἐκκλησιον*, in the Greek fragment, should be read *ἐπικλησιον*, and *vocationem* in the Latin translation *invocationem*; but the emendation is needless, since the meaning is the same without it, and Irenæus uses the same word elsewhere.

* Ib. V. ii. 3. (App. No. 3.)

It is quite plain that the New Oblation of Irenæus is a sacrifice of Bread and Wine, offered both as the first-fruits of the earth and as symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, who is the first-fruits from the dead. This is in close accordance with the Clementine Liturgy.

A still stronger testimony to the primitive Liturgy is found in a fragment from one of the lost writings of Irenæus, published by the learned Lutheran,* C. M. Pfaff, from a collection in the Royal Library at Turin:—

“Those who have become acquainted with the secondary constitutions of the Apostles, are aware that the Lord instituted a new oblation in the New Covenant, according to the word of Malachi the prophet, ‘wherefore from the rising of the sun even to the setting, My Name has been glorified among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered to My Name, and a pure sacrifice;’ as John also says in the Apocalypse, ‘The incense is the prayers of the saints.’ Also Paul exhorts us ‘to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service.’ And again, ‘Let us offer a sacrifice of praise, that is, fruit of lips.’”

“Now these oblations are not after the law, of which the Lord hath taken away the handwriting, blotting it out, but after the spirit; for it is necessary to worship God in spirit and in truth. Wherefore the oblation of the Eucharist is not carnal, but spiritual, and for this reason pure; for we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving Him thanks (*εὐχαριστοῦντες*), that He has commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our nourishment; and then, having completed the oblation, we invoke the Holy Spirit, that He would make[†] this sacrifice both the bread the Body of Christ, and

[†] ἀποφύνη, the same peculiar word as in the Clementine Liturgy, p. 268.

the cup the Blood of Christ, that they who partake of these antitypes may obtain the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. They therefore who celebrate these offerings in the Remembrance of the Lord (*ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει*), do not conform to the dogmas of the Jews, but ministering spiritually shall be called the children of wisdom ^s."

According to these early Fathers, then, the Eucharistic Sacrifice consisted of the *mincha*, or oblation of bread and wine, and the incense of prayer. It was offered *before* the Invocation, on receiving which it became *Eucharist*; no longer common bread and wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ, and so was received as the food of immortality. This entirely accords with the order and language of the Liturgies. The statement of Irenæus that the Eucharist consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, has proved a sore trouble to the advocates of transubstantiation. Bellarmine gives the usual explanation, that the earthly thing means the accidents, and the heavenly thing the Body and Blood of Christ, the only substance really present after consecration. But, besides that accidents cannot contribute to "the nourishment and increase of the substance of our flesh," Irenæus, like Justin Martyr, expressly attributes this nourishment to the Body and Blood of Christ. Massuet tries to meet the difficulty by understanding the earthly thing of the Humanity, and the heavenly one of the Divinity, of Christ. But this would make the natural Flesh of Christ to be actually *digested* into the flesh of the communicant.

Other Romish expositions are refuted by Pfaff^h, but

^s S. Irenæi Fragmenta Anecdota. Lugd. Bat. 1743. (App. No. 3.)

^h Ibid. p. 75.

he is less successful in establishing the Lutheran interpretation (lately revived in the Objective theory) of a *union* between the bread and Christ's Body. For in that case the bread, as the earthly part, must supply the nourishment of our bodies, and the Body of Christ, as the heavenly thing, should be reserved to the soul; whereas Irenæus expressly says that the Body of Christ nourishes the substance of our flesh. It is plain that by the Body of Christ he meant the bread itself, not another Body in union with it. So in the Liturgies the Invocation, to which he refers, does not call upon God to *unite* the Body and Blood to the bread and wine, but to *make* them the Body and Blood. Plainly it is the bread and wine—remaining such—which are the Body and Blood. It follows that the "heavenly thing" is not another substance united to the earthly, but a new and spiritual *power*, or condition, communicated to it. What Irenæus affirms is a *communion and oneness*¹ of flesh and spirit; the word is taken from the Apostle, who calls the bread the *communion* of the Body^k. Not that the bread holds the Body in physical union with it, but it is gifted with the power of communicating the Body; just as, in a lower way, the memorial of the peace-offering communicated the body of the holocaust to the Israelite who feasted on the remnant. The doctrine both of Justin and Irenæus clearly is, that the same bread which nourishes our flesh is the Body of Christ: and this is the hinge of the whole controversy.

Only three interpretations have been devised: 1. The *Roman*, that the bread is converted into the Body;

¹ *κοινωνίαν καὶ ἑνότητα.*

^k 1 Cor. x. 16.

2. The *Lutheran* and modern *Objective*, that the bread is united to the Body; 3. The *primitive* and *Anglican*, that the bread *is* the Body. The first annihilates the Sacrament; the second destroys the sacramental use by presenting the thing signified to immediate reception; the third, though disparaged as figurative, is the most literal reading of our Lord's words, and the only one which preserves the relation of the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*, as the "means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

Irenæus does not say that the heavenly thing is *inside* the earthly, "like the Pitt diamond in a casket, or rich wine in a worthless vessel¹." Nor that the two things unite to constitute a third, as oxygen and hydrogen, to compose atmospheric air². These figures are not only mutually incongruous, but destructive of the sacrament. The casket is *not* the diamond, nor the bottle the wine, neither is oxygen air; while, according to Irenæus, the bread *is* the Body and the cup is the Blood. To escape the contradiction, recourse is had to the ultra-Protestant refuge of a *metonymy*. The earthly casing is said to be called by the name of the heavenly contents, as men are called souls, and hot coals a fire³. The last is Luther's own illustration, which modern science rejects. The fire is not another substance within the coals, but a state or condition of the coals themselves. Burning coals *are* the fire, and

¹ Dr. Pusey's "Real Presence."

² "Doctrine of the Real Presence," by the Rev. R. C. Faulkner, Vicar of Bantry (Ponsonby, Dublin); an able and thoughtful pamphlet, though combining all these inconsistent illustrations.

³ Dr. Pusey's "Real Presence."

the bread is the Body. It is true that men are called souls, and for the same reason; men *are* souls, their bodies, not being souls, are not called so.

These illustrations all beg the question they are meant to prove. They *assume* a complex whole, compounded of two substances, and try to account for one having the name of the other. But Irenæus knows of only one substance in the sacrament; it is bread by nature, and Body in sacrament; whereas in no sense is a casket a diamond, or a bottle wine, or oxygen air; nor are they ever called so. Neither do these figures at all realize the sacramental idea. A casket is not a symbol of a diamond, nor a means of exhibiting it, but a case to lock it up and hide it; so a bottle is to preserve the wine, not to distribute it. Such cases must be *emptied* of their contents in order to partake of them. These relations are the reverse of sacramental. The casket is not altered by putting a diamond into it, or by taking it out again. The bottle is common glass, whether empty or full; but, according to the Fathers, the Eucharist is not common bread. Their earthly thing is not a case enclosing a heavenly jewel, but an earthly and visible symbol, by means of which a heavenly and invisible grace is imparted. To call such a sign by the name of the thing signified, is not a figure of speech, but a sacramental truth. The sacrament *is*, to all intents and purposes of the rite, what it represents and imparts; this is the key to all sound Eucharistic teaching.

In thus asserting the reality of the new oblation of the New Testament, both Justin Martyr and S. Irenæus are careful to distinguish it from the carnal sacrifices

of the Jews. Some would have us understand, that the Levitical sacrifices were *material*, and the Eucharistic verbal and mental only, which they call spiritual. Hence they limit the sacrifice to the things signified, and exclude the sacrament itself from the offering°. According to Irenæus, however, the oblation consists of bread and wine, as symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, and of the spiritual sacrifices of the Church. The things signified are offered by means of the material signs; but if material offerings are inconsistent with spiritual worship,—if they are unworthy of the Divine nature as revealed in the New Testament, and in fact incapable of reaching God,—how can they be symbols of an acceptable service? and why are they ordained? The Gnostics, whom Irenæus wrote against,

° Waterland, "Review," ch. xii., and Charge to the Clergy, 1738. After owning that Irenæus does speak of the Eucharistical oblations "under the notion of presents brought to the altar, and offered up to God for the agnizing Him as Creator," and that "he calls this a pure sacrifice;" the learned dignitary continues, "I take leave to add, that the material offering is not properly a present made to God, though brought before Him, for it is not consumed like a burnt-offering in God's immediate service, but goes entire to the use of man. Therefore the material offering is not the sacrifice, but the communicant's agnizing the Creator by it." No one knew better than Waterland the evasive character of the phrase "*proper* sacrifice," introduced (as he complains) by Bellarmine, and still obscuring the controversy. But Waterland was so completely the master divine of his day, that he seldom allowed any author, ancient or modern, to escape his correction. Irenæus undoubtedly held the spiritual service to be the truly acceptable part, not only of the Eucharistic but of all the Levitical offerings. He might well fail, however, to see why money spent in relieving the poor, or bread and wine eaten and drunk in the sacrament, are not as much "consumed in God's immediate service," as if they were burned with fire. It should be remembered that Waterland was engaged in refuting Johnson, who insisted on the opposite error, that the Eucharistic oblation is *nothing* but bread and wine.

would have found in this argument a conclusive proof that the God of the Old Testament was a different being from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, since the One delighted in material offerings, which the Other is too holy and spiritual to accept.

Irenæus reasons exactly the other way; he denies that material offerings were ever acceptable to God, except as the signs of a spiritual sacrifice; and he expressly affirms that the new oblation of the New Testament is the bread and the cup, as symbols of the evangelical worship. In these he recognises the *mincha* of the prophet, and in the accompanying prayers the incense which perfumed the oblation^p. This is also the doctrine of the early Liturgies from which many of his expressions might appear to be quoted. The difference between the Levitical and the Evangelical sacrifice is not laid in the discontinuance of material offerings, but in the spirit and faith in which they are offered. According to Irenæus himself, it is the difference between servile and filial worship; that is, as the Apostle explains, between the mediation of Moses and of the Son over His own House^q; between the shadow and the very image^r; between a worship "shut up under the law," and the liberty of the faith afterwards revealed^s.

^p Dr. Waterland judges it "very improper to interpret one part of this prophecy of spiritual service, i.e. prayers, and the other of a material loaf," (p. 331), and he proposes to correct Justin and Irenæus by the words of Tertullian, which he thinks more to his purpose. The impropriety, however, arises from the *dictum* that a verbal form of worship is spiritual, and a symbolical form is not. The Fathers evidently thought a loaf as spiritual as a prayer or a hymn, when offered with a spiritual intent. ^q Heb. iii. 5. ^r Ibid. x. 1. ^s Gal. iii. 23.

The Levitical rites typified a Sacrifice to come; their distinguishing feature was the shedding of blood; their leading thought was the curse and pollution of sin. The Eucharist is the remembrance and communion of the true Sacrifice, revealed, finished, accepted. Its characteristic is the absence of blood; the extinction of the curse in the Blood of Jesus once for all shed; the sanctifying of the spiritual Israel by the power of an endless life. These are great and palpable distinctions. They imply no diversity in the Object of both worships: the New is the consequent and supplement of the Old, it is no more required to be immaterial than to be invisible.

The attempt to exalt the sacrifice by suppressing the earthly part, is the vice of transubstantiation, and this false spirituality is only another phase of the same rationalism. The Fathers knew nothing of such intellectual conceits. To them the visible was a true sign and pledge of the invisible; and as such they both offered and received the sacrament. It was the Remembrance before God of the Atonement made once for all on the cross, and it was a present Communion of its benefits to the proper receivers. So far from dissociating the signs from the thing signified, they called them by the same name, and treated them as, in spirit and in truth, the same things.

The Eucharist was certainly not a sacrifice in the sense of the heathen and unbelieving Jews. The distinction was so obvious, that the primitive Christians were taunted with their want of sacrifices, altars, and temples¹. They accepted and gloried in the reproach.

¹ Origen, cont. Cels., vii. 62. See also Bp. Browne on Art. XXII.

The Eucharist was not a sacrifice as unbelievers understood the term, and to them it would have been disingenuous to call it so^u. Among themselves, however, the Church Liturgies gladly vindicated the appellation to its proper use. It was their way of exalting the Sacrifice of the cross over all that were falsely so called.

Athenagoras (A.D. 150) was one of the apologists who gloried in rejecting such sacrifices:—

“The Framer and Father of this universe does not need blood, nor the odour of burnt-offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and incense, but the noblest sacrifice to Him is for us to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens, and fixed the earth in its place like a centre; who gathered the waters into the seas, and divided the light from the darkness; who adorned the sky with stars, and made the earth to bring forth seed of every kind; who made animals, and fashioned man. When holding God to be this Framer of all things, who preserves them in being, and superintends them all by knowledge and administrative skill, we lift up holy hands to Him, what need has the Father of a hecatomb? The gods are represented in Homer as conciliated by libations and burnt-offerings. But what have I to do with holocausts, which

^u “Their only view of sacrifice was so low and bargaining, that the name could scarcely have been applied to the Eucharist in dealing with them, without danger of dragging it down to the level of their ideas; age after age had offered sacrifices, and nothing but selfishness had been the result in the human heart. Men all thought they were giving something to God to make Him love them, or that they were offering to Him some worship which He needed. The Christian Liturgy made a grand protest against this state of feeling, by proclaiming as the law of Christian sacrifice, ‘of Thine own have we given Thee.’”—*Drake’s Teaching*, p. 35.

God has no need of? Though, indeed, it does behove us to offer an unbloody sacrifice, and present the reasonable service ^z."

This is our earliest record of the famous term "unbloody sacrifice," in reference to Christian worship. It is found, indeed, in the singular work called "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," but apparently as a Jewish conception before the advent of Christ. In both places it is connected with the "reasonable service" of S. Paul, and the two expressions, which probably owe their origin to the philosophers, were early appropriated to the Eucharistic celebration, and may be so used by Athenagoras. If so, his words imply that neither "flowers nor incense" were used in the solemnity, but that it was not a sacrifice no more follows, than that it was not a visible act of worship. The tone of the passage strongly resembles some parts of the book of Job, and Job we know offered sacrifice continually. Such language is heard under every form

^z Athen., Leg. xiii. (App. No. 3.)

^y Testament of Levi, s. iii.; Grabe's *Spicilegium*, i. 159. 'Εν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰσι τοῦ προσώπου Κυρίου, οἱ λειτουργοῦντες καὶ ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς Κύριον ἐπὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων. Προσφέρουσι δὲ Κυρίῳ ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναιμάκτον προσφοράν. "In the fourth heaven are the angels of the face of the Lord, ministering and propitiating before Him for all the ignorances of the just. They offer to the Lord a rational savour of sweet smell, and an oblation without blood." Grabe inserts this piece in the Christian writings of the first century, in deference to the opinion of others, giving strong reasons on his own part for supposing it to be an Apocryphal writing under the Old Testament, interpolated by a Jewish Christian. In any case, the words put into the mouth of the patriarch Levi, are such as neither Philo nor Josephus would reject, and if the vision be compared with S. John's, the entire absence of the *Lamb* confirms its Judaic origin.

of religion, and must always be counterbalanced by the actual worship of the time and place.

The next Greek Father is Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 190), whose figurative and philosophical discourses throw but little light on the subject of our enquiry. He enlarges, like others, on the superiority of spiritual sacrifice, applying the word to every part of religion:—

“The best and holiest sacrifice we bring with righteousness, presenting it as an offering to the most righteous Word, by whom we receive knowledge, giving glory by Him for what we have learned. The altar then that is with us here, the terrestrial one, is the congregation of those who devote themselves to prayer, having, as it were, one common voice and one mind. . . . For the sacrifice of the Church is the word breathing as incense from holy souls, the sacrifice and whole mind being at the same time unveiled to God; . . . and will they not believe us when we say that the righteous soul is the truly sacred altar, and that holy prayer is incense arising from it? . . . For the sacrifices of the law allegorize the piety incumbent upon us.”

In like manner he continues:—

“Whence not in a specified place, or selected temple, or at certain festivals, and on appointed days, but during his whole life, the Gnostic in every place, even if he be alone by himself, and wherever he has any of those who have exercised the like faith, honours God . . . his sacrifices are prayers and praises and readings of Scripture before meals, and psalms and hymns during meals and before bed, and prayers also during the night. . . and what? does he not also know the other kind of sacrifice, which consists in giving both doctrines and money to those who need?”

* Strom., vii. 6. (App. No. 3.)

* Strom., vii. 7. Clement follows S. Paul in accounting alms-giving

It is needless to adduce other passages, in which Clement, in common with most of the Fathers, expatiates on the sacrifice of prayer, and of all good works. No one supposes from such language, that no churches or liturgical worship existed at Alexandria. Neither can it be questioned that Clement as a presbyter often celebrated the Eucharistic sacrifice. His writings, indeed, contain allusions to a Liturgy substantially the same with that of Irenæus:—

“Always tracing up to God the grave enjoyment of all things, he offers the first-fruits of food and drink and unguents to the Giver of all, acknowledging his thanks in the gift, and in the use of them by the Word given to him^b (i.e., by the consecration).”

And in another place:—

“The blood of the Lord is twofold. For there is the Blood of His flesh, by which we are redeemed from corruption; and the spiritual, by which we are anointed; and to drink the Blood of Jesus is to become partaker of the Lord’s immortality, the Spirit being the energetic principle of the Word as blood is of flesh. According as wine is blended with water so is the Spirit with man; and the one, the mixture of wine and water, nourishes to faith, while the other, the Spirit, conducts to immortality.”

The reference is to the mixed chalice, of which he says again:—

“The Scriptures apply the terms bread and water to nothing else but those heresies which employ bread and water

to be “sacrifice,” but neither seems to be aware of the subtle distinction detected by Waterland. See note, p. 327.

(App. No. 3.)

^a Pæd., ii. 2. (Ibid.)

^b Strom., vii. 6.

in the oblation, not according to the rule of the Church: for there are those who celebrate the Eucharist in mere water^d."

In the Alexandrian Liturgy, therefore, as well as that which Irenæus carried to Lyons, the Eucharistic oblation was bread and wine, denoting the Body and Blood of Christ. The distinction between the sacramental Blood "by which we are anointed"—(i.e., by which the Blood of the Sacrifice is applied in communion)—and the Blood once shed for our redemption on the cross, is decidedly opposed to any kind of corporal theory.

The water is here explained (perhaps with reference to 1 Cor. xii. 13) as a symbol of the Spirit invoked on the oblation, to make it drink of immortality. The sacrament nourishes faith in the sacrifice of Christ, and in communicating the receiver is made to partake of the Lord's immortality. Hence the Spirit is here (as in other Fathers) the Divine Nature of the *Logos*, rather than the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. This is the earliest explanation we meet with of the mixed chalice, and it is quite in harmony with the Liturgies. The *fact* was part of the original tradition of the Institution, and was corroborated by the mingled effusion from the side of the crucified Redeemer; but beyond this there was no uniform explanation of the symbolism.

The passage referring to Melchizedek makes no allusion to the sacrifice, but only to the participation:—

"For Salem is, by interpretation, peace, of which our Saviour is enrolled King; as Moses says, Melchizedek King

^d Strom., i. 19. (Ibid.)

of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who gave bread and wine, furnishing consecrated food for a type of the Eucharist. And Melchizedek is interpreted 'righteous king;' and the name is a synonym for righteousness and peace*."

Origen, who succeeded Clement in the academical chair of S. Mark (A.D. 202), discourses to the same effect on altars, temples, and images. Christianity does not rest in externals, but in a holy and religious life. He goes so far as to say, in answer to the heathen idea of the Divine Presence, that—

"Christians refuse to build lifeless temples to the Giver of all life^f, (and in the same spirit), that it is a holy day to the Lord, when we offer an unceasing sacrifice and pray without intermission, so that our prayer ascends as incense in the morning, and the lifting up of our hands is an evening sacrifice^g."

His meaning is not absolutely that they had neither churches nor holy days (which in other places he acknowledges to be in general use^h), but, as all the Fathers (and the Psalmists and Prophets before them) insist, that these are helps to religion, not religion itself. In like manner, he affirms the Levitical sacrifices to be abrogated, and exhorts us to seek our victims in our own souls. Preaching and teaching are sacrifices, and good works the most acceptable oblation; but when such passages are pressed against the Eucharistic sacrifice, the inference is destroyed by clear positive testimony on the other side. Origen, indeed, carried his philosophy to an extent that brought

* Strom., iv. 25. (Ibid.)

^f Cont. Cels., viii. 19.

(App. No. 3.)

^g Hom. ix. in Lev. sect. i.; (Ibid.)

^h Cont.

Cels., viii. 22. (Ibid.)

upon him the charge of heresy; but no suspicion ever attached to him in regard to the Holy Eucharist, and we shall find him no uncertain witness to its doctrine, though the allusions are not so full as might be desired, owing to the *disciplina arcana*, which now forbade a public disclosure of the sacred mysteries. He writes against Celsus:—

“The One God and His One Son and Word and Image we worship with such prayers and supplications as we can (*κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν*), presenting our petitions to the God of all by His only-begotten Son, to whom first we offer them, beseeching Him, who is the propitiation for our sins, to present, as High Priest, our prayers and sacrifices and supplications to God over all.” [Further on.] “We being accepted by the Creator of the Universe, also eat the loaves, that are set before Him with thanksgiving and the Invocation on the Gifts, and through the prayer made a certain holy Body, sanctifying those who receive it with pure intention. Celsus would have us offer first-fruits to demons. But we would offer them to Him who said, ‘Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth.’ And to Him to whom we offer first-fruits we also send up our prayers, having a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God; and we hold fast this profession as long as we live.” [And further on.] “We have a symbol of gratitude to God in the bread which we call the Eucharist¹.”

These last words entirely accord with Irenæus’s doctrine of the New Oblation and with the Liturgies. The allusion to the shew-bread, as a type of the Eucharist, has a special value, from Origen’s knowledge of

¹ Cont. Cels., viii. 13, 33, 34, 57. (App. No. 3.)

the Hebrew text, which no other Father till Jerome seems to have studied. He reverts to this remembrance (*askarah*, ἀνάμνησις) in one of his Homilies on Leviticus:—

Spiritualizing the unleavened bread, after the example of S. Paul¹, he says, the frankincense on each row signifies prayer out of a pure conscience; the Sabbath-day is the repose of the soul; and the sons of Aaron are the priestly race of all true believers. “Therefore the holy place is a pure mind, in which place it is commanded us to eat the food of the Word of God. . . . Whence this law is placed before thee, that when thou receivest the mystical bread, eat it in a clean place, i.e. receive not the Sacrament of the Lord's Body in a soul defiled and polluted by sins. For whosoever eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord; for they are holy things of holy things^k.”

Of the text¹ he had previously given three interpretations—1. The loaves were a remembrance of the twelve tribes, effecting perpetual intercession for each; 2. They were a remembrance of atonement, working propitiation; 3. They presignified the Word of God delivered to mankind in the Gospel. In the second of these explanations he breaks off with the remark, that he cannot discuss it further on that occasion, obviously from the restraint of the *arcana disciplina*. It is here, therefore, that we are to look for the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The words are these:—

“If these things are explained according to the importance of the mystery, we shall find that this remembrance

¹ 1 Cor. v. 8.

^k Hom. xiii. 5, 6. (App. No. 3)

¹ Lev. xxiv. 5, 9.

has the effect of the Great Atonement. Think of that Bread which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world, whom God has *set forth* for a propitiation through faith in His Blood. Think of that remembrance of which the Lord says, 'Do this for My remembrance.' Then you will see that it is this Remembrance alone which reconciles God to men. If, therefore, in these prescriptions of the Law you will attentively bear in mind the mysteries of the Church, you will find the form of future truth there delineated beforehand^m."

The *ἀνάμνησις* of the shew-bread was the frankincense which stood on the loaves, and was cast on the altar of burnt-offering when they were changed. Its office was to unite the loaves to the holocaust, and communicate its virtue to them, so that they were eaten by the priests in the holy place as part of the offerings of the Lord made by fire. In like manner, the "bread set before God with thanksgiving," to represent the spiritual Israel, being united to the Sacrifice of the cross by the *ἀνάμνησις* of the words of Institution, is eaten as the Body of the sacrifice, "sanctifying those who receive it with pure intention." It is still bread when it is eaten; it is the Body in the same sense that the shew-bread was the holocaust; it communicates the effect of the great Atonement, which reconciles God to men,—the "propitiation through faith in His blood." In thus combining the Apostle's doctrine with the type of the shew-bread, Origen includes the cup in the antitype, and confirms its reference to the Body sacrificed, and the Blood shed for the remission of sins. He further indicates the necessity of faith, and of communion in both kinds.

^m Hom. xiii. sec. 5. (App. No. 3.)

Origen is distinguished for that love of speculation, which was the passion of the Alexandrian school. To him the visible was always an enigma of a timeless, ceaseless, invisible^a. In another of his Homilies on Leviticus, adverting to what he calls a twofold offering of the blood,—first, at the door of the tabernacle, and again on the altar,—he says that in like manner:—

“Jesus shed His Blood not only in Jerusalem, where was the altar and its base, and the tabernacle of the congregation, but also on that altar which is above in the heavens, where is the Church of the first-born; that altar He has sprinkled with His Blood; for as the Apostle says, ‘He hath reconciled by the Blood of the cross all things unto Himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.’ Rightly, therefore, does he name in the second place the altar which is at the door of the tabernacle, because Jesus was offered as a victim not only for things on earth, but for things in heaven; and here upon earth He poured out the substance of His Blood, but in the heavenly place by the ministry of priests, if there be any there, He immolates the life-giving energy of His Body as a spiritual sacrifice^o.”

This passage as it stands is so perplexing, that some corruption in the text may perhaps be suspected. The “door of the tabernacle,” means the court in which the altar stood, and the two offerings *there* would be the *worshipper's* and the *priest's*^p. The type of the “altar above in the heavens,” must be sought with-

^a This characteristic is well observed upon in Mr. Drake's “Teaching of the Church during the First Three Centuries,” which has been of use to me in enlarging this chapter.

^o Hom. i. in Lev. s. 3.

(App. No. 3.)

^p Lev. i. 3—5. See p. 29.

in the vail, where both the mercy-seat and the altar of incense were reconciled by the blood of the sin-offering. In this way there is indeed a twofold offering of the Blood of Christ, first on the cross, and secondly in the holy place not made with hands⁹. This may be what Origen wrote, for in another place he says :—

“ We must seek a High Priest who offered a sacrifice to God once in the year, that is, through all this present age¹. . . . This High Priest is none other than Christ. The day of propitiation remains for us till the sun sets, that is, the end of the world. For we stand without, waiting for our High Priest who lingers in the holy of holies, i.e. with the Father, and prays for the sins of those who wait for Him². ”

The hesitating allusion to a ministry of priests in heaven, may have reference to his idea that “ the souls of the martyrs are said in the Apocalypse to *stand* at the altar, and therefore perform priestly ministrations³. ” In the Apocalypse, however, the souls are seen “ *under* the altar, ” (the place of the blood). They are victims, not priests, and so far from interceding, they cry like the blood of Abel for vengeance⁴. It is not improbable that Origen, who was the first to quote the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, may intend some allusion to the passage before cited from Levi; but there is a better authority in the Apocalypse, where the prayers of the saints are offered at the altar in

⁹ Heb. ix. 12.

¹ “ Semel in anno, id est per omne hoc præsens sæculum. ” Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 26, “ till He come. ”

² Hom. ix.

in Lev. s. 2. (App. No. 3.)

³ Hom. x. in Num. s. 2.

⁴ Rev. vi. 9, 10. No different reading is known, to justify the interpretation which Ruffinus has imputed to Origen.

heaven by an angel, really filling the office improperly ascribed to the martyrs^x. If this angel represents the ministry of the Church below, we can discern the point that Origen may have aimed at. The Blood of Christ, presented by Himself in the holy place not made with hands, as the life-giving energy of His Body, is also presented in sacrament by His priests at the altars of the Church. In this way there is a twofold offering, and both continuous; one, real, ceaseless, and timeless, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," in which Christ alone is Priest; the other, successive and by way of remembrance, from the sacrifice on Calvary till He come again. This is offered by the priests who represent Him on earth, and its coming up for a memorial before God by the hands of the angels, (as supposed in the Liturgies,) would be a priestly ministration in heaven. This was undoubtedly the belief of the early Church, and Origen may be accepted as a witness to it, though (if the text is to be relied upon) he has given a wrong explanation^y. With regard to the sacramental side of the Eucharist, Origen says:—

"It is not the matter of the bread, but the word said over it, which profits him who eats it not unworthily of the Lord.

^x Rev. viii. 3. See p. 38.

^y In Hom. vii. in Lev. sect. 2, we read: "He stands now in the presence of God interceding for us. He stands at the altar, that He may offer an atonement to God. . . . He yet endures bitterness for us sinners." These expressions can be justified only from Origen's exaggerated habit of excluding the thought of *time* from the Divine actions. We shall find a less transcendental way of speaking in S. Chrysostom. Mr. Drake has some excellent remarks on this doctrine of Origen, pp. 70—94.

No wicked man is capable of eating the Word made Flesh, for if it were possible that a wicked man, so continuing, should eat Him that was made flesh, seeing He is the Word and the Living Bread, it would not have been written, that whosoever eateth this Bread shall live for ever ^a."

And again, on the Institution :—

"God the Word did not term that visible bread which He held in His hand His Body, but the Word in mystery of which that bread was to be broken ^a."

This is the doctrine of consecration found in many Fathers, and followed by Bishop Andrewes in a passage previously cited ^b. The sacrament is not the Person of Christ, but a similitude of Him. He is Word and Flesh, the Eucharist is word and bread; but in the similitude the union is not indivisible as in the Person. The Word which hallows the sacrament is not vouchsafed to "any who receive it unworthily." The *paronomasia* between the Living Word and the spoken word (i.e. the words of Institution), implies a Real Presence of Christ in virtue of the consecration; but the presence is not *hypostatic*, or indefectible, to the "matter of the bread," since an unworthy communicant does not receive it. Origen clearly recognised the discourse at Capernaum as pertaining to the Eucharist, but distinguished between the sacramental and the spiritual eating, to the effect explained in our third chapter ^c.

Turning now to the Latin Fathers, we find *Tertulian*, (*circ.* 200), repeating the cardinal truth, that the

^a In Matt. xv. 15. (App. No. 3.)
ser. 85. (Ibid.)

^b See p. 176.

^c In Matt. Comment.
See p. 59.

bread is the Body, not another thing containing, or united, or converted into the Body. Writing against the Docetic heresy, he says,—

“Then, having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own Body by saying, ‘This is My Body,’ that is, the figure of My Body. A figure however there could not have been, unless there were first a true Body. . . . He declared plainly enough what He meant by the bread, when He called the bread His own Body. Likewise, when making mention of the cup, and making the testament to be sealed with His Blood, He affirms the reality of His Body, for no blood can belong to a body which is not of flesh. . . . That you may discover how anciently wine is used as a figure for blood, turn to Isaiah, who asks, ‘Who is this that cometh from Edom?’ &c. [Isa. lxiii. 1, is interpreted of the Passion, the wine-juice representing His Blood, and so Gen. xlix. 11.] Thus did He now consecrate His Blood in wine, who then used the figure of wine to describe His Blood ^d.”

To some who abstained from the Eucharist on station days, through fear of breaking their fast by receiving the Body of Christ, Tertullian suggests that they might take the Eucharist and keep it by them till the fast was over^e. Clearly, then, none could be present at the sacrifice without receiving the communion; moreover, what they received as the Lord’s Body was still bread, since their fast would have been broken by eating it.

A similar reservation of the elements is mentioned by S. Basil in the next age, as observed at Alexandria and in Egypt, where the people were in the habit of

^d Adv. Marc., iv. 40. (App. No. 3.)

^e De Orat., xix. (Ibid.)

carrying away part of what they had received to communicate by themselves at home^f. Doubtless it was to prevent this abuse that the priests began to put the bread into the mouth of the communicant. It must be obvious that what was so carried away, and consumed in private, could not have been invested with the Divine honours paid to the Host in the modern Church of Rome.

In the passage last referred to, Tertullian calls the Eucharistical celebration "the prayers of the sacrifices," and the communion the "participation of the sacrifice." He speaks of their "standing at God's altar" as the ordinary appellation of the holy table. So in another part:—

"That we go not up to the altar of God before we have laid aside any quarrel or cause of hatred we may have against a brother. For what thing is it to go to the peace of God without peace? to the remission of sins while we retain them?"

The *pax Dei* makes it certain that the Eucharist is meant, and the reference to Matt. v. 23 asserts the authority of Christ Himself for the sacrifice.

Tertullian is the first to speak of "oblations for the dead:"—

"for whose spirit you make request, for whom you render annual oblations^g. She (the widow) prays for his soul, and requests refreshment for him meanwhile, and fellowship with him in the first resurrection, and she offers on the anniversaries of his falling asleep^h."

^f Bas., Ep. 93.

^g De Cast., c. xi. (App. No. 3.)

^h De Monog., c. x. (Ibid.)

The oblation was beyond question the Eucharistic celebration, at which departed souls were included in the intercessions. The sense of communion with them was indulged by celebrating the rite at funerals and their anniversaries, and the only Christian ground of hope for all was the Sacrifice of the cross. This, therefore, was undoubtingly pleaded for the dead, as for the living, not to deliver them from a purgatory then unheard of, nor to obtain remission of sins, since they were beyond the reach of temptation; but for whatever their state might require, for refreshment from the presence of God, and final re-union with the whole company of the redeemed at the resurrection. Such are the intercessions of the Liturgies, and offering them along with the symbols of the Saviour's Passion was an oblation of His Body and Blood—of His most precious Sacrifice on the cross—for the persons so commended to the throne of grace.

None of the Fathers carried the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice higher than *S. Cyprian*, (d. A.D. 258). The "sacrifice" is his usual name for the celebration. He expatiates on the analogy of the New Testament offerings with those of the law, using the words "sacrifice," "priest," and "altar," equally of both, and even quoting the Levitical rules of sacerdotal purity as binding on the Evangelical ministry. He describes the public worship as "meeting together with the brethren in one place, and celebrating divine sacrifices with God's Priest¹." He cites the prohibition against carrying any of the paschal lamb out of the house, as shewing that "the Flesh of Christ, the holy

¹ De Orat. Dom., iv.

of the Lord, cannot be sent abroad," by which he means that schismatics cannot celebrate a true communion^k.

Yet that Cyprian conceived the oblation of the Eucharist to be very different from that of the cross, is plain from his exhortation to the confessors at the mines:—

"There cannot be felt any loss either of religion or faith, most beloved brethren, in the fact that now there is given no opportunity there to God's priests for offering and celebrating the divine sacrifices; yea, ye celebrate and offer a sacrifice to God *equally precious and glorious*, one that will greatly profit you for the retribution of heavenly rewards, since the sacred Scripture speaks, saying, 'The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit, a contrite and humbled heart God doth not despise.' You offer this sacrifice to God: you celebrate this sacrifice without intermission day and night, being made victims to God, and exhibiting yourselves as holy and unspotted offerings, as the Apostle exhorts and says, 'I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God'.^l"

In applying the expressions used in the Liturgies of the Eucharistic elements, to the bodies and souls of the martyrs, Cyprian clearly indicates that both were conjoined in the Christian sacrifice, which was therefore vastly inferior to the sacrifice of Christ. It would have been blasphemy to extol the self-sacrifice of the martyrs as "equally precious and glorious" with the One Offering of the cross.

Again, of the sacrifice for the dead, Cyprian quotes

^k De Unit., viii.

^l Ep. lxxvi. 3.

a canon, not now found in the African Code, that if a bishop leave a presbyter executor of his will, (a burden which the Roman law did not allow to be declined,) "no offering should be made for him, nor any sacrifice be celebrated *pro dormitione ejus* ^m."

This canon corroborates the language of the Liturgies produced in our last chapter, and proves the sacrifice to be totally different from that of the Tridentine Mass. The deceased is supposed to be in peace, and would be included in the general commendation of the departed. A canon against reciting his name in the diptychs could not be meant to operate as an excommunication in the grave, where there is no repentance. It simply withheld a discretionary honour in the Church from one who had violated the Church's injunctions. In enforcing this canon, Cyprian writes:—

"It is not allowed that any offering be made by you for his repose, *nor any prayer be made in the church in his name.*"

Supplications of this kind were not *limited* to the Eucharistic Office. This is expressly stated in the African canon, which provides that when a bishop or other person dies in the evening, the commendation shall be performed with prayers only, without the Eucharist ⁿ. The commendations, made immediately after the death, were repeated on the anniversary, but there is no hint of remission of sins, much less of deliverance from pain, being communicated to the

^m Ep. lxxv. 2; (Oxf. ed., Ep. i.)
xxix.; Cod. Ecc. Afr., can. xli.

ⁿ Conc. Carth. III., can.

departed from the Eucharistic celebration. Indeed, the commendation was equally made *without* the sacrament.

Cyprian, like the rest of the Fathers, supposes all present at the sacrifice to communicate in both kinds. The delivery of the cup by the deacon was a thing not to be avoided by any one present at the celebration^o. Of one who ventured to receive with the rest unworthily, he writes:—

“He could not eat or handle the Holy of the Lord, but found in his hand when opened that he carried a cinder. Thus by the experience of one it was shewn that the Lord *withdraws when He is denied*; nor does that which is received benefit the undeserving of salvation, since saving grace is changed by the departure of the sanctity into a cinder^p.”

This implies that the unworthy do not receive the Lord's Body. Private Masses must have been also unknown, since one of Cyprian's objections to evening celebrations, is that—

“we cannot call the people together to our banquet so as to celebrate the truth of the sacrament in the presence of all the brotherhood^q.”

Cyprian was a sturdy opponent of all tradition against the letter of Scripture. On this ground he stoutly resisted the decree of the Roman Pope on the subject of heretical baptism. In the Eucharist he insists on the necessity of following strictly the example of

^o De lapsis, 25.
(Oxf'd. lxiii.) ad Cæc. 16.

^p Ibid., 26. (App. No. 3.)

^q Ep. lxii.

Christ. He has no doubt that our Lord offered a sacrifice in the Institution, nor that the cup which He offered was mingled of wine and water. Still, he observes that the wine alone was that which He called His Blood, adding an explanation of the water curiously contrasting with his profession of strict adherence to the original Institution. Observing that in the Apocalypse, the waters signify peoples and multitudes[†], Cyprian expounds the water in the chalice as a symbol of the *people*, whom our Lord associated with His own Body in the sacrifice:—

“ For because Christ bore us all, in that He also bore our sins, we see that in the water is understood the people, but in the wine is shewed the Blood of Christ. But when the water is mingled in the cup with wine, the people is made one with Christ, and the assembly of the believers is associated and conjoined with Him on whom it believes; which association and conjunction of water and wine is so mingled in the Lord’s Cup, that that mixture cannot any more be separated[‡]. ”

Cyprian was famous for discovering “ hidden and obscure sacraments[†], ” and we may perhaps credit him with the *invention* of this allegorical sense of the water. He was so pleased with it, as to declare that in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, *even as wine alone cannot be offered*. Now, though it is probably true in fact, that our Lord blessed a mixed chalice, it is certain that He *spoke* of nothing in the cup but His Blood. That He designed to symbolize the people by the water is assuredly not revealed

[†] Rev. xvii. 15.
(App. No. 8.)

[‡] Ep. lxii. (Oxf. lxiii.) ad Cæc. 13.
Ep. lxxvii. 1.

in Scripture, nor was it ever generally the belief of the Church. This is one of those numerous explanations which are invented after the fact, to account for the origin of traditional usages. Other explanations of the mixture, devised in later times, have been repeated with equal confidence; but all are conjectural, and extraneous to the sacrament. The Catholic doctrine is, that "wine is that which Christ called His Blood," and whatever the water may have meant in the Paschal chalice, it was His Blood, and nothing else, which Christ gave in the mystery of the cup. We may observe further, that as Cyprian held the water to be the *symbol*, not the real bodies, of the people, so he must certainly have held the wine to be the symbol, and not the real Blood, of Christ in the oblation.

To Cyprian belongs the further discovery of Melchisedek's typical sacrifice; the argument rests entirely on the Eucharistic oblation being of the same things:—

"For who is more a Priest of the most high God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that very same thing which Melchisedek had offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His own Body and Blood. . . . In Genesis, therefore, that the benediction in respect of Abraham by Melchisedek the Priest might be duly celebrated, the figure of Christ's sacrifice precedes, namely, as ordained in bread and wine; which thing the Lord completing and fulfilling, offered bread and the cup mixed with wine, and so He who is the fulness of truth fulfilled the truth of the image prefigured^u."

^u Ad Cæc., 4. (App. No. 3.)

The good Pope of Carthage knew how to help out a tradition quite as well as his rival at Rome. All he says, however, is, that Melchisedek's sacrifice was a figure of the Sacrifice of the cross, and the Last Supper and the Holy Eucharist were the same. So Jerome—

“Who, in type of Christ, offered bread and wine, and consecrated the Christian mystery in the Body and Blood of the Saviour.”

In the celebration itself, Cyprian insists on exact conformity to the original institution :—

“For if Jesus Christ our Lord and God is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates that which Christ did : and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered.”

This makes the Supper a figure of the Sacrifice on the cross. As Cyprian considers both to be exhibited in the Eucharist, he must have held the one to be *symbolical* of the other; otherwise, Christ would have sacrificed Himself twice. The Melchisedekian type, therefore, requires the bread and wine of the supper to be retained in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, mystically to exhibit the Body and Blood of the cross. Thus he affirms that the

“Lord's Passion is the sacrifice which we offer, and we ought to do nothing else than what He did, for Scripture

† Paul. et Eustoc. ad Marc.

† Ad Cæc., 14.

says: 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till He come.' As often, therefore, as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and His Passion, let us do what it is known the Lord did *.'

The conclusion implies not only communion in both kinds by all present, but the entire consumption of the elements. Cyprian alludes, indeed, elsewhere to the practice of the communicants taking part of the gifts home for private daily reception', but he has no trace of their adoration, or of any other use than manducation.

S. Cyprian has been thought to introduce a view of the sacrifice differing from that of the earlier Fathers. With Clement, Justin, and Irenæus, the *oblata* are the bread and cup, offered in token of thanksgiving, with a special remembrance of the death of Christ. This we have seen is the language also of the earlier Liturgies. S. Cyprian repeats the same doctrine, but adds that the *Passion itself* is the sacrifice, the Body and Blood of Christ are offered; and this was afterwards amplified into Christ Himself, slain and sacrificed on the holy table. Differently as these expressions sound to modern controversialists, they will be found, on examination, to mean substantially the same. Cyprian himself explains, that by offering the Lord's Passion he means shewing forth the Lord's death; the cup is offered in commemoration of the Lord and His Passion. And S. Chrysostom, the greatest proficient in these rhetorical expressions, after saying, "we offer the same sacrifice," qualifies the words by immediately adding, "or rather, we celebrate

* Ad Cæc., 17. (App. No. 3.)

† De lapsis, 26.

the remembrance of the sacrifice." Less than this could not have been intended by Justin or Irenæus. To offer bread and wine in remembrance of the Passion, is to offer the Passion itself in the only way that a thing past can be offered. The Fathers did not suppose these gifts to be literally delivered into God's possession, or that any event could be literally recalled to His memory. By "offering" and "presenting" they meant, pleading the sacrifice before God ;—*objectively* (as Mede writes) to the Divine contemplation and acceptance. When the bread and wine were offered in visible symbol, the things signified by them—the Body and Blood or Passion of Jesus Christ—were offered in faith and prayer, as the propitiation through which pardon and acceptance were besought.

In the later Liturgies, the expressions point more to the things signified than to the signs ; still, in all the actual *oblata* are the elements, not the Person of Christ, nor even His Death. For of neither of these could the Church implore God that "they might be carried by the angels to the altar in heaven." This petition, retained in the Roman Missal to the present day, is a standing protest against the Tridentine sacrifice. It is the worship of the Church below, that the angels are to bear up to heaven, for a memorial before God ; indeed, the earliest Liturgy of all prays for the reception of the gift, "through the mediation of Christ," without mentioning the angelic ministry. The offering of Christ's death, or of Christ slain, means the presentation of the appointed symbols of His Body and Blood, to commemorate and plead the Sacrifice once for all made on the cross.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, at the beginning of the fourth century, gives an account of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which might serve for a description of our own Liturgy. After citing Gal. iii. 13 and 2 Cor. vi. 21, he proceeds :—

“ After all these things, having consecrated Himself a kind of wondrous sacrifice and chosen victim to the Father, He offered for the salvation of us all, delivering also to us a memorial to offer continually to God in place of sacrifice ;’ (he quotes Ps. xl. 1—9, and continues) teaching in effect that, instead of the former sacrifices and holocausts, the incarnate presence of the Christ, and His prepared Body, should be offered to God ; and this very thing is preached in His Church, as a great mystery foretold by the voice of prophecy in the volume of the Book. And we truly, having been taught to celebrate the memorial of that sacrifice on the table, by symbols both of His Body and saving Blood, according to the laws of the New Testament, are again instructed by the prophet David ^a. . . . Clearly, then, in these words is signified the mystic chrism, and the holy sacrifices of Christ’s table, in celebrating which we have been taught to offer to God Most High, through His High Priest, supreme over all, the unbloody and reasonable, and to Him acceptable, sacrifices throughout our life. And this also the great prophet Isaiah foresaw by the Spirit ^a. . . . And again, the prophetic writings proclaim these unbodily and intellectual sacrifices ^b. . . . And again ^c. . . . All these, therefore, enjoined from the first, are celebrated at the present time by all nations, through the Gospel doctrine of our Saviour, the truth now bearing witness to the prophetic voice, by which God, rejecting the Mosaic sacrifices, reveals that which was to come to us, saying ^d. . . . We then,

^a Ps. xxii. 5.

^a Isa. xxv. 1, 6, &c.

^b Ps. l. 14, 15.

^c Ibid., cxli. 2 ; li. 17.

^d Mal. i. 11.

indeed, sacrifice to God Most High a sacrifice of praise, we sacrifice the divine and holy and sacerdotal sacrifice, we sacrifice in new form according to the New Testament the pure sacrifice, for the sacrifice of God is said to be a broken spirit. . . . Therefore also we burn the prophetic incense, presenting to Him in every place the sweet-smelling fruit of the true religion, offering by the prayers to Him ; which also another prophet teaches, saying, ' Let my prayer come before Thee as incense.' Wherefore we both sacrifice and burn incense ; then, indeed, celebrating the memorial of the great sacrifice by His appointed mysteries, and presenting to God the thanksgiving for our salvation in devout hymns and prayers ; then also consecrating ourselves to Him, and to the Word His High Priest, reposing on Him both in body and soul. And we exercise ourselves to preserve our body from all infirmity, unspotted, and undefiled, to Him. And we present the mind to Him purified from all passion, and all stain of maliciousness, and we worship Him with pure thoughts, and sincere purposes, and perfect principles ; for these we have been taught to believe are acceptable to Him, rather than the multitude of sacrifices celebrated with blood, and smoke, and smell of flesh *."

It is impossible to put the spiritual sacrifice higher. Yet, far from excluding the material offering, Eusebius recognises it as the authorized means of presenting the spiritual. The spiritual sacrifice, offered "through-out our whole life," is collected and presented in the Eucharist, the special purport of which is to celebrate the memorial of Christ's Sacrifice on the table. The newness of this oblation is not in its being spiritual, (for such all acceptable oblations ever were,) but in presenting the symbols of the Lord's Body and Blood.

* Eus. Dem. Ev., i. cap. 10. (App. No. 3.)

The right discernment of these symbols is the condition of the spiritual sacrifice, and without them there would be no sacrifice or Liturgy at all.

In describing the dedication of Constantine's new church at Jerusalem, Eusebius, after speaking of the sermons as "a banquet of rational food," says:—

"Such as were unable to arrive at these things, appeased the Deity with unbloody sacrifices and mystical immolations, humbly offering up their prayers to God for the common peace, for the Church of God, for the emperor (the founder) and his pious children^f."

So, in describing the consecration of a church, he says:—

"The ceremonies of the prelates were perfect, both the services of the priests and the other sacred rites of the Church; here a place for psalmody and hearing the other utterances given us from God; here for the divine and mystical consecrating ministeries; here, too, were the ineffable symbols of the Saviour's Passions^g."

And again, he asks:—

"Who else but our Saviour ever gave to His disciples to offer unbloody and reasonable sacrifices, celebrated by prayers and mystical invocation? Whence, throughout the world are established altars, and consecrations of churches, and Divine Liturgies of mental and rational sacrifices^h."

These passages all refer to the Eucharistic celebration. The value of the offering is placed, as it always

^f V. C., iv. 45. (App. No. 3.)

^g E. H., x. iii. (Ibid.) Valesius very arbitrarily interprets these last words of baptism, but they plainly refer to the Eucharistic elements.

^h Oration in praise of Constantine, cap. xvi. (Ibid.)

was, in the faith and prayer of the offerer, rather than the gift itself. Yet the gift is a necessary part of the sacrifice, and that which distinguishes it from other forms of worship. This is the doctrine also of Justin and Irenæus. It hardly needs to be pointed out, that an oblation which derives its chief value from the spiritual state of the offerer, cannot really be the Person or Body of God's dear Son: it is a "mystical immolation," "the symbols of His Passion," i.e. of His slain Body and outshed Blood.

Commenting on Genesis xlix. 12, Eusebius writes:—

"He Himself gave the symbols of His Divine economy to His disciples, commanding the image of His Body to be offered; for since He no longer desired sacrifices of blood nor the slaughter of divers beasts, as under Moses, but commanded to use bread as the symbol of His own Body, He well foreshadowed the purity and cleanness of this food in saying, His teeth are white as milk. And the same thing is mentioned by another prophet, who says, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a Body hast Thou prepared me¹."

Cyrl of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) wrote a sort of Companion to the Altar, explaining the Liturgy, as we still find it in the Greek formularies.

On the exclamation "holy things to holy persons," he observes:—

"The oblations lying on the altar are holy, receiving the descent of the Holy Ghost. Ye also are holy, being also sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Then you answer, 'There is One holy, our Lord Jesus Christ.' Truly there is One Holy—holy by nature; but we are also holy, not by nature, but by participation, by exercise, and by prayer."

¹ Dem. Ev., viii. 1. (App. No. 3.)

Here a very decided distinction is drawn between Christ and the consecrated oblation on the altar. He proceeds to direct the communicant—

“to make the left hand a support for the right, as being about to receive the King, and, keeping the palm hollow, take the Body of Christ, saying, Amen. Then after communicating of the Body of Christ, to draw near and take the cup of His Blood, not reaching out the hands, but bowing down and in a posture of worship and adoration, saying, Amen¹.”

These directions are clear for the separate communion in both kinds. They further indicate the deep reverence due to the consecrated elements as sanctified by the Holy Ghost. In this respect, however, they hardly come up to our own practice of receiving *on the knees*. There is no hint at any adoration of Christ, or of His Body, in the material object received.

In a previous chapter Cyril writes :—

“For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity (which, it will be remembered, was *subsequent* to the recital of the words of Institution) were simple bread and wine, but the Invocation being made, the bread becomes the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ, in the same manner the meats of the worship of Satan being in their own nature simple food, by the invocation of demons become profane¹.”

And later on :—

“We beseech God, the lover of men, to send His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him, that He may make

¹ Cat. Myst., iv., v. (App. No. 3.)

the bread the Body of Christ, and the cup the Blood of Christ. For that on which the Holy Ghost descends is sanctified and changed." And, "When we have finished the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody worship in that propitiatory sacrifice, we pray to God for the common peace of the Church, &c. Then we also make mention of those who are at rest before us; first the patriarchs, prophets, deceased bishops, and fathers; lastly, for all those who once lived with us, and are now departed; believing it to be a great benefit to their souls, for whom prayer is made while the holy and tremendous sacrifice lies before us^k."

These passages are decisive on the nature of the change effected by consecration. It is not a change of substance, but of power and virtue; not an addition of sanctity as another *thing*, but making the bread itself to be holy. This consecration is called perfecting or consummating the spiritual sacrifice, and it is after this that the prayers for the common peace of the Church, including the dead, were offered. This is altogether different from the modern Mass for the dead.

The comparison of the meats offered to Satan is equally conclusive against conversion, co-existence, or any other corporal theory of the sacramental presence. The bread becomes the Body by the Invocation; whence he says:—

"Let us with all confidence communicate as of the Body and Blood of Christ; for in the figure of bread is given to thee His Body, and in the figure of wine, His Blood^l."

For the original ἐν τύπῳ the Latin translation has

^k Cat. Myst., v. 4.

^l Ibid., iv. 1.

sub specie^m, which in English was rendered "in the kind," or "under the form," expressions all meaning the same thing. The *species* was the bread or wine itself, not the metaphysical "accidents," and there was no notion of *inclusion*. It was just as we still say, that a sum of money was paid, or conveyed, in the form or shape of a bank-note. Hence Cyril goes on :—

"For thus we become Christ-bearers, because His Body and Blood are diffused through our members ; thus it is that, according to the blessed Peter, we become partakers of the Divine nature." Then, quoting John vi. 53, "they not hearing spiritually were offended and went back, supposing that He was inviting them to eat flesh." And after a reference to the shew-bread, "for as the bread has respect to our body, so is the Word appropriate to our soul. Contemplate, therefore, the bread and wine not as bare elements, the bread and wine as common, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith stablish thee. Judge not the matter from taste but from faith, be fully assured without misgiving that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christⁿ."

This is the doctrine of Justin and Irenæus. The bread is itself the Body ; it is diffused through our members. But it is the Body *ἐν τύπῳ*, not in substance, nor in bare figure, but in actual value, (as the note is the money) ; and this value, which is ascribed to the Word, and appropriate to the soul,

^m The prepositions *sub*, *in*, *per*, &c., were used indifferently before the corporal Presence was invented.

iv. 1, 2. (App. No. 3.)

ⁿ Cat. Myst.,

is participation of the Divine nature. Hence it follows:—

“After this you hear the chanter with a sacred melody inviting you to the communion of the holy mysteries, and saying, ‘O taste and see that the Lord is good;’ trust not the decision to the bodily palate, no! but to faith unfaltering; for when we taste, we are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ^o.”

Cyril’s commentary marks the period when the traditional Liturgies began to be collected and reduced to writing. It proves the substantial identity of the forms used by the ante-Nicene Fathers; and the substance is still apparent amid the accretions of later ages.

Ambrose (A.D. 374) is credited with much that was not his. His celebrated expression, “in that sacrament Christ is, because it is the Body of Christ,” constitutes the whole strength of the corporal theory, and was almost the only patristic saying that Paschasius could find to his purpose. The passage is as follows:—

“True is the Flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried; the true Flesh surely was crucified, was buried; truly, therefore, this is the sacrament of His Flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself declares, ‘This is My Body.’ Before the blessing of the heavenly words another kind (*species*) is named, after the consecration the Body is signified. He Himself saith it is His Blood; before consecration it is called other, after the consecration it is named Blood. And thou sayest *Amen*; i.e. it is true. What the mouth speak-

* Cat. Myst., v. 17. (App. No. 3.) In the 2nd book the same word *ἁρτιστον*, and also *κοινωνία*, are used of the sacrament of Baptism.

eth, let the inward mind confess; what the speech uttereth, let the affection feel." [Further on.] "With these sacraments, with which the substance of the soul is strengthened, Christ feedeth His Church, and seeing continual progress in grace, addresses her, 'How fair,' &c. Why He speaks of meat and drink understand O faithful. Why I have spoken of bread and wine the faithful understand^p. There is no doubt that in us He Himself eateth and drinketh, as thou hast read that in us He saith He is in prison. Whence the Church, too, seeing so great grace, exhorteth her sons and neighbours to flock to the sacrament, saying, 'Eat, my neighbours,' &c. What we eat, what we drink, the Holy Ghost hath in another place told thee by the prophet, saying, 'Taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.' In that sacrament Christ is, because it is the Body of Christ; it is not therefore bodily food, but spiritual. Whence, too, the Apostle saith of its type, 'Our fathers did eat spiritual meat, and did drink spiritual drink.' For the Body of God is a spiritual Body; the Body of Christ is the Body of the Divine Spirit, since Christ is Spirit; as we read, 'the Spirit^q before our face is Christ the Lord^r.'"

All this is perfectly Anglican, but in many points clearly opposed to the Roman and Lutheran explanations. In the first place, communion in both kinds is the one object of the sacrament. There is no hint of any other use. It is after the blessing (i.e. not in the oblation, but in the communion) that the elements are called the Body and Blood. Next, the thing signified is the crucified and buried Body, not the glori-

^p Compare this well-known phrase with the answer in our Catechism, "taken and received by the *faithful* in the Lord's Supper."

^q Lam. iv. 20, LXX.

^r De Initiandis, viii., ix. (App. No. 3.)

fied Humanity. Lastly, the Body in the sacrament is a spiritual Body, such as the Body of God and the Holy Ghost. This must refer to the Divine nature of Christ, not the Humanity. S. Ambrose does not say with the Council of Trent, that the soul and divinity of Christ are in the sacrament by reason of the vital and hypostatic union with His Body and Blood, but that the living Christ is there, because He there gives His crucified and buried Body for the nourishment of the soul.

The phrase "spiritual Body," is explained by "spiritual food," quoted from 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. In there terming Christ "a spiritual Rock," the Apostle meant that He was the spiritual fountain signified by the Rock. The "spiritual meat and drink" were the spiritual refreshment typified by the manna and the water. In like manner, the spiritual food of the sacrament is the spiritual benefit it imparts to the soul, and the "spiritual Body" must be understood in the same way. It is not the Human Body of Christ spiritualized and glorified, for the word is used also of the First and Second Persons, who are not incarnate. In this application at least, "body" must be a metonymy for "person," existence, or substance. S. Ambrose says the sacrament is "not bodily food, but spiritual," i.e. food for the spirit, not the body. In support of this he says that "the Body of God is a spiritual Body," meaning undoubtedly that God is not Body but Spirit; and in proceeding to extend the phrase to Christ, he can only refer to His Divine nature. There is no thought of that kind of "spiritual body" which the Roman and some other divines have borrowed from the

ancient *docetæ*;—a body exempt from all the laws of body, and existing only after the manner of a spirit. Such a being the Fathers would have called a spirit, not a body; the very core of Christianity is, that the Son of God has taken to Himself a Body *like unto our own*, sin only excepted. This *true* Body, truly crucified and buried, is (according to S. Ambrose) in the sacrament, and it is there because the Godhead is there to effect its mystical Presence. Even so, God is in all things, and especially in His means of grace, but we are not obliged to be Pantheists in order to confess His presence.

Another famous passage from S. Ambrose is the following :—

“The image of God is Christ”; Christ, therefore, came to the earth that now we might not walk in a shadow, but in the image. He who follows the Gospel walks in the image. First, then, the shadow went before, the image followed, the truth will be. The shadow in the Law; the image in the Gospel; the truth in the heavenly places. The shadow of the Gospel and the congregation of the Church, in the Law; the image of the truth to be, in the Gospel; the truth, in the judgment of God. Therefore, of those things which are now celebrated in the Church, the shadow was in the discourses of the Prophets, the shadow in the deluge, the shadow in the Red Sea, when our Fathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, the shadow in the rock, which poured out water and followed the people. Was not that in a shadow a sacrament of this all-holy mystery? Was not the water from the rock, in a shadow, as it were blood from Christ, which followed the people, fleeing from itself, that they might drink and not thirst, might be redeemed and not perish? But now

* Heb. i. 3.

hath the shadow of night, and of the darkness of the Jews departed; the day of the Church hath drawn nigh. Now we see good things by an image, and we hold the good things of the image. We have seen the High Priest coming to us; we have seen and heard Him offering for us His Blood; we priests follow as we can; that we may offer sacrifice for the people; although weak in deserts, yet honourable in sacrifice; since though Christ is not now seen to offer, yet Himself is offered on earth when the Body of Christ is offered; yea, Himself is plainly shewn to offer in us, Whose word sanctifieth the sacrifice which is offered. And Himself, indeed, standeth as our advocate with the Father; but now we see Him not; then shall we see Him, when the image shall have passed away, and the truth shall have come. Then, at length, not in a glass, but face to face, shall be seen that which is perfect. Ascend, therefore, O man, into heaven, and you shall see those things of which here there was the shadow, or the image¹."

And again,—

"Here is the shadow, here the image, there the verity. The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the verity in the heavenly places. Before, a lamb was offered, or a calf; now Christ is offered. But He is offered as a man, as receiving the Passion. And He Himself as Priest offers Himself to remit our sins, here in image, there in truth, where, as our advocate with the Father, He intercedes for us²."

The character here assigned to the Eucharistic Sacrifice is that of a *mirror* reflecting the "very image" of the Passion, which cast its *shadow* on the Levitical worship. Though a nobler sacrifice than any of the Old Testament, it is yet far inferior to the true sin-

¹ Enarratio in Psalmum xxxviii. (xxxix. 6.) (App. No. 3.)

² De Officiis, c. xlviii. (tom. iv. 36.) (Ibid.)

offering, whose Blood is presented in the holy place on high. Such a "reflection" well expresses the office of a liturgical remembrance. It exhibits the object so truly, as to make it present to us for all needful purposes; and yet it is not identically the same thing. The High Priest in heaven is accomplishing the propitiation, of which the Eucharist is the reflection in the Church below. We must ascend up into heaven to reach the source and original of the image. Hence, He Himself is said to be offered on earth when His Body is offered in image in the Eucharist. And He whose word sanctifies the sacrifice, is also seen to offer in the image of His representatives; while in His own Person He standeth as our Advocate with the Father. S. Ambrose does not say He offers in heaven, but by His representatives on earth. In heaven He "ever liveth to make intercession," and this we shall find very expressly stated by S. Chrysostom.

The language of Ambrose with respect to the sacrifice of Christ in the sacrament is further explained by his disciple, S. Augustine, who often affirms that Christ is immolated in the sacrament, but with this explanation subjoined:—

"that is, the immolation of Christ is represented, and a remembrance of His Passion is made^v." "Christ is slain to any one when he believes Him to be slain^w." "Christ is daily immolated to us when out of the relics of this very thought we believe in Christ^x." "The Flesh and Blood of this sacrifice, before the Advent of Christ, was promised through victims of similitude: in the Passion of Christ it

^v De Consec., Dis. ii.

^w Quæst. Evan. II., xxxiii. 5.

^x In Psalm lxxiii.

was exhibited in the very truth; after His Ascension it is celebrated through a sacrament of remembrance⁷."

This most learned Father insists that every true body consists of parts, containing greater and lesser spaces of place:—

"Take away local extent from bodies, and they will be nowhere; and since they are nowhere, they will not be at all. . . . We are not to doubt that whole Christ is present everywhere as God . . . and in one certain place of heaven, by reason of the nature of His True Body⁷." "He is always with us by His Divinity, but if He were not *corporally absent from us*—*nisi corporaliter abiret a nobis*—we should always carnally behold His Body, and never spiritually believe^a."

And again:—

"Our Lord is above, but also the truth of the Lord (*veritas Dominus*) is here. For the Body of the Lord in which He rose must be in one place; His truth, or the truth of it (*veritas ejus*) is everywhere diffused^b."

"According to His corporal presence Christ is in heaven, at the Father's right hand; according to the presence of faith, He is in all Christians^c."

Of the sacrament he says:—

"Our Lord hesitated not to say 'This is My Body' when He was giving the sign of His Body^d."

In another place he writes:—

"If the Apostle Paul . . . could yet preach the Lord Jesus Christ by signifying Him at one time by his tongue,

⁷ Cont. Faust., xx. 21. (App. No. 3.)
lvii. cap. vi. 8.

^a Ad Dard., Ep.

^b De Verb. Dom., Sermon. lx. (al. cxliii.) 4.

^c Tract in Johann. xxx. 1.

^d Sermon. cxx.

^e Cont. Ad., xii. 3.

at another by letter, at another by the sacrament of His Body and Blood ; and yet neither his tongue, nor parchment, nor ink, nor significant sounds uttered by the tongue, nor marks of letters written upon skins, do we call (*dicimus*) the Body and Blood of Christ, but that alone which, taken of the fruits of the earth and consecrated with the mystic prayer, we receive rightly to our spiritual health (*rite ad salutem spiritalem*), in memory of our Lord's Passion for us ; and when this is by the hands of men brought to that visible form (*speciem*), it is not sanctified so as to become so great a sacrament, save by the Spirit of God working invisibly*."

This is a clear testimony to the superiority of sacraments over preaching, as being not only a sign and declaration of the truth, but a sign with the force or power of the truth annexed. It also shews that the African Liturgy agreed with the Greek in the prayer of Consecration. Further, *species*, as in all the Latin Fathers, means the whole substance, not the forms and accidents, of bread and wine: the Greek Fathers use *εἶδος* in the same sense. On the Gospel of S. John, Augustine writes :—

"Well, then, all these things were signified ; and did they not believe the same things as we believe, they by whom these signs were ministered, they by whom the same things which we believe were prophetically foretold ? Of course they believed ; only they believed that the things were to come ; we that they are come. Accordingly, he also saith thus : 'They drank the same spiritual drink,' spiritually the same, for bodily it was not the same. For what was it they drank ? 'For they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them ; and that rock was Christ.' See then

* De Trin., iii. iv. 10. This passage is transcribed from Dr. Harrison's *Catena*, because he finds fault with the briefer quotation in my first edition.

the signs varied, while the faith is the same. There the rock was Christ; to us that is Christ which is placed upon the altar of God. And they, as a great sacrament of the same Christ, drank water flowing from the rock; we drink, the faithful know what. If thou look at the visible form (*speciem*) the thing is another; if at the intelligible signification, they drank the same spiritual drink '."

And again, in another place :—

"Understand spiritually what I have said; ye are not to eat this Body which ye see, nor to drink that Blood which they who will crucify Me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery; spiritually understood it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood."

The sentiment quoted in our Article XXIX. is often repeated :—

"He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him. This, then, it is to eat that meat and drink that drink, to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him. Therefore, who dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt doth neither spiritually eat His Flesh nor drink His Blood, albeit carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; but rather doth unto judgment to himself eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing^b."

The type of Melchisedek is referred to in the usual way :—

"So our Lord Jesus Christ is shewn to be our King; He Himself also is our Priest for ever after the order of Mel-

^f Exp. in Ev. Joan., tract xlv. (App. No. 3.)

^g In Psalm

xcviii. (xcix.) (Ibid.)

^h In Ev. Joan., tract xxvi. (Ibid.)

chisedek, who offered Himself a sacrifice for our sins, and commended a resemblance of His sacrifice to be celebrated in memory of His Passion; that which Melchisedek offered to God we now see to be offered in the Church of Christ throughout the whole world¹."

S. Augustine does not say either that our Lord offers as a Priest in heaven, or that the Church's ministry on earth is after the order of Melchisedek; but that Christ, who alone is Priest after that order, did once offer Himself a sacrifice for sin, and that the Eucharist is a resemblance of that sacrifice in the same materials as the oblation of Melchisedek. This is very different from the Tridentine Decree.

While thus enforcing the primary character of the sacrament as the remembrance and participation of the atoning Sacrifice of the cross, S. Augustine is hardly less full on the other side of the rite, as a sacrifice of body, soul, and spirit by the worshippers themselves. This was always, he insists, the essential condition of acceptable sacrifice under the Law, and it is necessarily more prominent under the Gospel. Those sacrifices were for the same moral and spiritual purposes as our own:—

"Nor were such sacrifices, in the slaying of cattle, done by the ancient fathers, which now God's people read of but do not, to be otherwise understood than that by those things these were signified, which are performed in us to the same end, that we may have union with God and take care of our neighbour. Therefore a visible sacrifice is the sacrament of an invisible sacrifice. . . . In the Epistle which is written to the Hebrews, it is said, 'But to do good and to communi-

¹ Oct. Quæst. 61. (App. No. 3.)

cate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased,' Heb. xiii. 16: and where it is written, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' it is necessary that no other sacrifice be understood than the sacrifice preferred; since that which is called a sacrifice by all men is a sign of the real sacrifice. But, moreover, mercy is a real sacrifice, whence that is said which I called to mind a little before: 'With such sacrifices God is well-pleased.' . . . Truly it cometh to pass that the whole redeemed city itself, that is, the congregation and society of saints, is offered a universal sacrifice to God by the High-Priest, who also offered Himself in His Passion for us, in the form of a servant, that we might be the body of so great a Head^k."

Chrysostom (A.D. 398), who may be called the Augustine of the East, does not hesitate to describe the Eucharist as a sort of re-enacting of the spectacle of the cross:—

"Christ lies before us slain^l. His death is celebrated^m, the sacrifice is brought forth, the Lord's sheep is slainⁿ. The Blood is emptied out of His spotless side into the cup^o, all the people are purple-dyed in that precious Blood^p. He has given us to be filled with His Flesh, He has offered Himself to us *sacrificed*," (killed^q).

In these rhetorical speeches the object exhibited in the sacrament is not the risen Christ, or His glorified Humanity, but His dead Body and Blood, "the carcase," as he elsewhere speaks, "to which the eagles mount up and fly^r." Now the corpse of Jesus Christ

^k De Civitate Dei, x. 5, 6. (App. No. 3.)
Jud., i. 6.

^m Hom. in Act. xxi. 4.

^l Hom. de Prod.

ⁿ In Ep. ad Eph.

^o De Pœn. in Euc.

^p De Sac., iii. 4.

^q Hom. li. 3, in Matt.

xiv. 23.

^r Homily on the Worthy Receiving.

cannot be present to any one, after the resurrection, save by faith and in representation. If it were, He must again be slain, and the communicants would be really purpled with His Blood. But then how could this be an "unbloody sacrifice?" That phrase, wherever it originated, is a standing denial of a real sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and was probably so intended from the beginning.

Chrysostom is far from supposing that Christ Himself has any further sacrifice to offer:—

"When thou hearest that He was a Priest, do not think that He is always acting as a Priest, for He acted as Priest once, and then sat down. And lest thou should suppose that He is standing above and is a minister (deacon), the Apostle shews it to be part of the dispensation. For as He was made a servant, so also a Priest and a Deacon: but as being a servant He did not remain a servant, so being a deacon He did not remain a deacon. It is not the place of a servant to sit, but to stand. This, then, silently indicates the greatness of that sacrifice, which being one, and once offered, yet did what all other sacrifices could not do. . . . Therefore he states the matter up and down fully and clearly, saying, 'There is one Priest only and one sacrifice only,' lest any should think there are many, and thus grievously err*."

Again:—

"As there was a great difference between Aaron and Christ, so there is equal difference between us and the Jews. For behold we have our Victim above, our Priest above, our Sacrifice above; therefore let us offer such sacrifices as can be presented on that altar, no longer sheep and oxen, no longer blood and incense. All these are abolished, and there

* In Heb., hom. xiii. (App. No. 3.)

is introduced in their stead a rational worship. And what is rational worship? The things offered by the soul, the things offered by the spirit †."

So he proceeds :—

"Christ was once offered. By whom was He offered? by Himself, of course. Thereby He shewed that He is not only Priest, but also the offering and the victim for the sacrifice. What then? Do not we Christians offer daily? We do offer, but we make a remembrance of His death. And this is one and not many. How one and not many? Because it was once offered, like that which was brought into the Holy of Holies: that was a type of this, and this is the self of that. For we always offer the same, not now one animal, to-morrow another, but always the same thing. So, then, the sacrifice is one; else, since it is offered in many places, there would be many Christs. But no; there is but one Christ everywhere, here entire, there entire, one Body. As, then, He being offered in many places is one Body and not many bodies, so also there is one sacrifice. Our High-Priest is He who offered the sacrifice that cleanseth us: that same sacrifice which was then also offered we offer now, that the inexhaustible. For this is for the remembrance of that which took place then; for He saith, 'Do this for My remembrance.' We do not make a different sacrifice (as the high-priest did), but always the same, or rather we make the remembrance of that sacrifice".

It is obvious that the Thing and the Remembrance of it are not identically the same. They are the same in presenting the death of Christ as the one sacrifice for sins. But He offered it in person and in fact; we

† In Heb., hom. xi. (App. No. 3.)
hom. xvii. (Ibid.)

‡ In Ep. ad Heb.,

in representation and sacrament. S. Chrysostom finds a proof of the sameness in the bread and wine prescribed for the oblation. But he does not suppose that identically the same bread and wine are used at every Eucharist; the sameness is in their being always the same symbols of the one Body and Blood. It is no more implied that the bread was converted into the Body (or contained the Body within it), than that the bread and wine of to-day were converted into those of yesterday.

In one of the Homilies attributed to S. Chrysostom, we find the difference between the sacrament and the verity, which we have already seen in Clement of Alexandria:—

“If it be dangerous to transfer to private uses these holy vessels in which there is not the true Body of Christ (*verum Corpus Christi*), but the mystery of His Body is contained, how much more the vessels of our body, which God has prepared for a habitation for Himself*.”

Nothing could more explicitly attest that the true Body is not in the paten, but the mystery of it; or that the Divine Presence is in the communicant, not in the sacrament.

S. Chrysostom follows the other Fathers in interpreting Mal. i. 11 of the Eucharist:—

“See how excellently and clearly he foreshadowed the mystical Table, which is an unbloody sacrifice. But he calls holy prayer the pure incense which is offered with sacrifice. . . . There is, then, a pure sacrifice; the first, indeed, is

* Add. Hom. on Matthew, hom. xi. (App. No. 3.)

the mystical Table, a sacrifice heavenly and world-wide. But there is also among us a difference of many sacrifices. For since the Law and the Old Testament had many sacrifices, one for sins, another called a burnt-offering, another of praise, another of salvation, another for the cleansing of lepers, with others many and various for those encompassed with innumerable pollutions, and the number of the sacrifices was great and without end according to the Law; but now grace having come, embraces all sacrifices in one, establishing one true sacrifice. . . . Thou hast therefore the first sacrifice, the gift of salvation (previously called the intellectual and mystical gift spoken of by S. Paul in Eph. v. 2, and therefore the sacrifice of Christ, commemorated and partaken of in the Eucharist); the second, of martyrs; the third, of prayer; the fourth, of a joyful noise; the fifth, of righteousness; the sixth, of alms; the seventh, of praise; the eighth, of contrition; the ninth, of humility; the tenth, of preaching¹."

In like manner, S. Augustine calls all pious works sacrifices, as included in the self-oblation of the Church in union with the remembrance of Christ, which constitutes the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

So Chrysostom again :—

"For this cause, the awful mysteries, so full of that great salvation, which are celebrated at every communion, are called a sacrifice of thanksgiving, because they are the commemoration of many benefits, and signify the very total of God's care for us, and work upon us, in all ways to be thankful²."

And once more :—

"The Scripture is accustomed to call both the mysteries

¹ Hom. in Ps. xcvi. (App. No. 3.)

² In Matt., hom. xxv. (Ibid.)

and the whole Church by the name of flesh, saying, that they are the Body of Christ ^a."

In another place, he writes:—

"There are occasions when there is no difference between the priest and those under him; for instance, when we are to partake of the awful mysteries; for we are all alike counted worthy of the same things. Not as under the Old Testament, when the priest ate some things and those under him others, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of the things which the priest partook of. Not so now, but before all one Body is set and one Cup. And in the prayers also we may observe the people have a great share . . . when we have excluded from the holy precincts those who are unable to partake of the holy table, another prayer is to be offered, and we all alike fall on the ground, and all alike rise up. Again, when it behoveth to receive and give the peace, we all alike salute each other. Again, in the most awful mysteries themselves the priest prays for the people, and the people also pray for the priest; for the words 'and with thy spirit,' are nothing else. The offering of thanksgiving, again, is common, for neither doth he give thanks alone, but also all the people. For having first taken their voices, when they assent that it is meet and right so to do, then he begins the thanksgiving. And what marvel that the people utter with the priest, when indeed with the very Cherubim and powers above they send up in common those sacred hymns ^b."

We have now arrived at the close of the fourth century, before the rise of the Monophysite schisms, and it is needless to carry the citation further. Enough has been produced to shew that in the undivided

^a In Epist. ad Galat. (App. No. 3.)
hom. xviii. (Ibid.)

^b In Epist. II. ad Cor.,

Church, according to the concurrent testimony of Canons, Liturgies, and Fathers, the Holy Eucharist was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, expressed by a visible oblation of bread and wine. The *oblata* had a twofold signification, (1.) As the fruits of the earth, they were a tribute of gratitude for the mercies of Creation, Providence, and Redemption, implying devout oblation of the worshippers, and of the whole Church, as a living sacrifice to God; (2.) As symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, they were offered for the Remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and received as the Communion of the things signified, for the remission of sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. The Communion was an essential part of the sacrifice; and there was no difference in this respect between the priest and the other worshippers. All present at the ministration were expected to receive the Communion; there was no other way of assisting at the sacrifice. The effect of receiving the Body and Blood of the sacrifice was spiritual union with the risen and glorified Lord, personally present, to dwell in us, and we in Him. As an act of intercession, the Eucharist was celebrated for the living and the dead; but the sacrament was consecrated for actual Communion, and no other use of it,—no sacramental Presence apart from communion,—was known to Catholic antiquity.

These are the main propositions, and in these the Fathers are unanimous. It is not pretended that no expressions of theirs admit of any other interpretation. The Fathers were not infallible, even if we could accept as genuine all that bears their names. Their

language, and possibly their views, were not always rigidly consistent; nor do we charge on the Council of Trent the absolute *invention* of the errors and superstitions which it unhappily bound upon the Roman See. Practices, at first innocent, or even laudable, became abused in course of time. Figurative and mystical language was confounded with literal. The decay of letters, after the triumph of the barbarians in the West, favoured the growth of superstition, while Scripture was unhappily neglected, and the schoolmen employed their logic, and the Church its authority, to elaborate into dogma the misconceptions of a darker age.

A reform was inevitable, when the fall of Constantinople covered Europe with the wreck of Greek literature, and the invention of printing rescued the Bible from the seclusion of the cloister. The Word of God was then again seen to be the true standard of the Church's faith; they who believed its promises to the Church herself sought to discard the accretions of superstition, without relinquishing their hold on the Catholic body. This was pre-eminently the aim of the English Reformation. The conservative instincts of our nation combined with its strong practical good sense, to shape a middle way between blind obedience and unnecessary innovation. The task might have been easier but for the power of the Papacy, and the notorious corruptions of the Fathers, through the dishonesty of the later copyists. Still the Church of England learned to speak with no uncertain sound, and her voice deepened and grew firmer as she felt her hold upon antiquity more assured.

The true Churchman may be thankful to receive, from the light of modern learning, a further confirmation of her appeal to the old godly doctors. Still it is not the Fathers, but the Scriptures and the Church, which claim our allegiance. The Anglo-Catholic stands related to the Fathers through his own mother Church, not by private choice. It is by membership with her that he has communion with the Catholic Church; far from seeking to supplement her utterances by his own selections from antiquity, he sits at her feet, and hopes to die in her arms, as the *only* Church that to him "hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith^c."

^c Article XX.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ENGLISH LITURGY.

THE distinguishing feature of the English Liturgy, as of the English Reformation, is derived from the unbroken continuity of the National Church. As the nation, in casting off a foreign yoke, made no change in its existing relations with the "Three Orders of Ministers, which have been in Christ's Church from the Apostles' times*;" so, in rejecting liturgical corruptions, and compiling a vernacular Book of Common Prayer, there was not the least intention of deviating from the primitive and Catholic worship.

It has been observed that :—

"There are not more than three possible modes of a Christian form of worship. Either the sermon constitutes the main portion and centre of the worship, so that the remainder, hymn and prayer, are merely subservient assistants; or the main act of worship is a Liturgy, in which there is a reading aloud of passages of Scripture and forms of prayer; or in the third the worship is an actual celebration of the whole work of Redemption;—a communion in which all who are present participate in the complete act of the Lord's Supper, and in which each of the whole community offers himself up with Christ, a victim to the Father, as the most perfect form of adoration to the Almighty God.

"The first form (the writer continues) is indisputably the most suitable to the old and true Protestantism; the second is that which has been chosen by the English Established

* Preface to Ordinal.

Church, and though pleasing to the higher classes, is not so universally acceptable to the populace; the third is the form of worship of the ancient Church, and of the ecclesiastical communities which have maintained their continuity, either without interruption or essential change; such as the (Roman) Catholic, the Greek, the Russian, and the Monophysite Churches in Asia and Africa^b."

The eminent divine who wrote these words in the Roman obedience, has since acquired yet greater eminence from engaging in a similar old Catholic Reformation to our own. Enjoying in his noble protest the sympathies of the whole Anglican Communion, he will allow us to demur to the place here assigned to our Church and Liturgy. We affirm, on the contrary, that as this Church most unquestionably "maintained her continuity" at the Reformation, so the ancient worship, described in the third alternative, is more truthfully exemplified in our Book of Common Prayer, than in any of the ecclesiastical communities enumerated by Dr. Döllinger. The Churches of the Roman obedience are those which have most widely departed from the Catholic form of worship. The foreign language, the non-communicating attendance, the denial of the cup, the adoration of the host, and the almost entire disappearance of the self-oblatory feature^c, in the impos-

^b "The Church and the Churches," by Dr. von Döllinger, M^cCabe's translation, p. 304.

^c The Canon of the Mass contains but the faintest possible allusion to any sacrifice by the people. "Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants and handmaidens N. and N., and of all here present, whose faith and devotion are known to Thee, for whom we offer Thee, *or who offer Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and all theirs*," &c. Even here it is not a sacrifice of *themselves*, but of something *for* themselves; while every-

sible endeavour to repeat the vicarious sacrifice of the cross, make the Roman Mass very different from "a communion in which all who are present participate in the complete act of the Lord's Supper, and in which each of the whole community offers himself up with Christ a victim to the Father."

On the other hand, these words exactly describe the purport and effect of the Anglican Liturgy. So far from subordinating the Eucharistic worship to the preliminary Lessons and Prayers, the very first reform in our ritual was an English Office for Communion in both kinds^d. The first Book of Common Prayer, issued the year after, placed the Eucharistic rite in the front and centre of public worship. It contemplated daily celebration in cathedrals and other places, and in all parish churches on Sundays and other Holy Days at the least^e. The only condition was the requirement of a genuine Communion, in place of the fictitious one approved by the Council of Trent, and every

where else the sacrifice is distinctly limited to the celebrant. Contrast this with the Eucharistic Prayer in our own Post-Communion, "And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee," and it will be obvious which answers best to the ancient, Catholic, and most perfect form of adoration to the Almighty.

^d A.D. 1548, Bishop Sparrow's Collection. Reprinted 1869. (Rivingtons.)

^e "In Cathedral Churches, or other places where there is daily Communion, it shall be sufficient to read this Exhortation above written once in a month; and in Parish Churches, upon the week-days, it may be left unsaid. And if upon the Sunday or Holy Day the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the priest earnestly exhort his parishioners to dispose themselves to the receiving of the Holy Communion more diligently, saying these or the like words unto them."—*Rubric*, 1549.

effort was made to fulfil this condition, by exhorting the people to communicate^f.

From these views our Church has never receded. In cathedral and collegiate churches, where there are many clergy, the rule is still that all shall communicate with the celebrant every Sunday *at the least*. Every parishioner is required to communicate three times in the year, of which Easter is to be one. The Church lacks power to enforce her discipline in England, as in Rome and every other part of Europe; but if the "complete act of communion" be taken as the test of Catholic worship, it will be found far more fully realized in the Anglican Churches than in any other whatever.

The moral and spiritual unfitness of the multitude for "the most perfect form of adoration to the Almighty," has been the common difficulty from the third century downward. How Chrysostom dealt with it has been seen at p. 254. The Tridentine Churches cut the knot by directing the priest to offer it by himself, in the presence of a prostrate but non-participating audience. The Calvinists fell back upon prayer and sermon, in which the officiating minister is still the sole performer, the people joining only in the hymn. Standing between these vicious extremes, the Anglican Liturgy refuses either to desecrate, or to

^f The intention of the Sermon in this Office (still the only Sermon prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer) was shewn by the Rubric: "After the Creed ended shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided, wherein if the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, then shall the Curate give this exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same."

withdraw, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It not only maintains the Holy Eucharist in its character of the chief means of grace,—the privilege acquired by Confirmation, the sanctification of Matrimony and Holy Orders, the consolation of mourners at funerals, the rite which unites the sick and dying believer, in the body of the Church, with the great Sacrifice of the cross ;—but it persistently presents it as the supreme act of worship in the Christian congregation. It will not harden and debase the non-communicant, by a fictitious participation in the sacrifice of another, but after preparing the altar and the sacrifice in the presence of all, and exhorting all to their duty, it proceeds to the complete act with as many as are ready, in the exercise of their Christian priesthood, to eat of the holy things in the holy place.

So far from forsaking the ancient form of Divine Service, the Church of England has formally disclaimed any intention of departing even from modern branches of the Church Catholic, except where they had themselves departed from Catholic antiquity ^a.

With regard to the Eucharist in particular, she insists, before all things, on the ancient Catholic antiquity ^b. This was the principle on which our Liturgy was first compiled ; and at the Savoy Conference, previous to the last Review, the commissioners were charged—

“to advise upon and review the Book of Common Prayer, comparing the same with the most ancient Liturgies which have been used in the Church in the primitive and purest times.”

^a *Ante*, p. 141.

^b *Ante*, p. 18.

This principle restored at once the "complete act" of communion in both kinds and by all present, together with the use of the vernacular tongue; it excluded at the same time the adoration of the host, with all other consequences of the modern error of transubstantiation.

Still, the Church of England has not hesitated to assert that authority in decreeing rites and ceremonies, without which the ancient Liturgies could never have existed. The power exercised by S. Basil and S. Chrysostom, and by innumerable bishops and abbots after them, was not to be denied to the rulers of the English Church in reducing the numerous "uses"—provincial, diocesan, and capitular—to one national Liturgy. This measure was demanded, not only for the purity of the religious Offices themselves, but for the consolidation of the State, then growing into a new consciousness of national life, after the decay of the feudal system from the fall of the nobles in the wars of the Roses, and the loss of the foreign possessions of the Crown¹. Modifications were required by the necessities both of Church and State, and with the Catholic instinct, which prompts the Churchman ever to look to the "pit from which he was hewn," it was determined to adhere to the Western model in preference to the Eastern. Whatever the origin of Christianity in Bri-

¹ The effect of these political changes, in enabling the English Church to complete its long struggle against the papal supremacy, is not always sufficiently considered. Henry the Eighth's was the first reign in which the national life found room to grow, and Elizabeth's was that which brought it to maturity. Hence the extraordinary popularity of those despotic sovereigns. The Revision of 1661 was equally necessary on the National Restoration of Church and State after the Puritan Rebellion.

tain, the English, as a nation, belonged to the Western Church ; the Latin Offices were in possession, and there was no call to forsake them for the Greek.

These Latin Offices are not to be mistaken for the modern Roman Missal, which is the badge of post-Tridentine ultra-Montanism. The first Liturgy of the Church of Canterbury was doubtless the Sacramentary of Gregory. Augustine was not the man to exercise the freedom accorded him by the larger-minded pope, and if his Missal could now be recovered, we should possess the most authentic monument of the Roman rite at the end of the sixth century. Whatever variations it received in this country would come from the Gallic Liturgy previously brought into Britain, and the Oriental element might be increased under the Greek Archbishop Theodore. Certainly the cup was administered to the laity long after the Norman Conquest, and therefore under the original Use of Sarum, which was compiled by Bishop Osmund about the year 1078, only forty-five years before the Lateran Council. Our other Uses, not being traced to any particular prelate, are probably more ancient ; but it is now impossible to distinguish the original from the accretions, which grew out of the authority exercised by bishops, chapters, and convents, over the services of their respective churches. The parts in which the most uniformity prevailed were the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass ; even these were not always exempt from additions and interpolations ; while the accompanying ceremonial of gesture, lights, and vestments, differed widely at different times and places^k. The

^k " I do not hesitate to say, that the distinctions of the ancient Liturgies of the Church of England, both between themselves and the modern

first reform after the rejection of the Papacy, was an expurgated edition of the Sarum Ritual in 1541¹, and about the same time a *Rationale* of rites and ceremonies was issued, which followed the old mediæval superstition of investing each with a doctrinal or religious signification:—

The *Amice*, it was said, represents the covering of our Lord's head, and the faith of the priest. The *Albe* is the gorgeous robe of Herod, and the garment of innocence. The *Girdle* is Pilate's scourge, and the priest's continency. The *Stole* is the rope that bound Christ to the pillar, and the yoke of priestly patience. The *Chasuble* is the purple robe of the soldiers, and the charity which is above all. The priest crosses and kisses the altar to signify Christ's humble obedience to the Passion. He elevates the consecrated elements, both that the people may worship the same, and also to signify Christ's exaltation on the cross, and from thence to the

Roman Use, in the Ordinary and the Canon, are not only as great, but greater and more in number, and involving points of higher consequence, than a previous acquaintance with these matters, before an actual examination of the English Missals, would have authorized us to expect."—Maskell's *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, pref. xv. At p. xxiv. is a quotation from Archbishop Anselm, acknowledging the existence of numerous diversities: "non in substantia sacramenti neque in virtute ejus, aut fide discordant, neque omnes in unam consuetudinem colligi possunt." The origin of them he ascribes to the diversity of men's minds, quoting the golden rule, "si unitas servatur charitatis in fide Catholica, nihil officit consuetudo diversa."

¹ "Portiforium secundum usum Sarum noviter impressum et a plurimis purgatum mendis. In quo nomen Romano pontifici falso ascriptum omittitur una cum aliis quæ Christianissimi nostri Regis Statuto repugnant. Excussum Londini per Edvardum Whytchurch, 1541."—Collier, *E. H.*, p. ii. b. iii. Burnet has given such excellent reasons why no new Service-books were issued, that it is almost a pity he was wrong in the fact.

right hand of the Father. The *Commixtion* of the elements is to signify the re-union of Christ's body and soul at the resurrection.

So, too, of other ceremonies. Altars are washed, to admonish Christian people to wash their hearts and consciences. Bearing candles on Candlemas-day is a very good usage in memory of Christ, the Spiritual Light, spoken of in the Gospel of the day. Ashes upon Ash-Wednesday put us in remembrance of our frail nature, and the uncertainty of life. The palms on Palm Sunday are in memory of Christ's entering Jerusalem, and to shew our desire to receive Him into our hearts. The consecration of oil and chrism, on Shier Thursday, signify the imperial and priestly dignity of Christ, from whom we have the name of Christians. Creeping to the cross on Good Friday, and kissing it, are to humble ourselves before Christ, in memory of our redemption by the cross. Processions after the uplifted cross, signify that we are Christ's faithful soldiers, marching after His banner^a.

The Papacy at this time was clearly considered an excrescence, which could be cut off without injury to the national faith or worship. This was as far as Henry VIII. would consent to go. He may be said to have died a Romanist in all points but the pope. Cranmer, however, and his colleagues, must undoubtedly have been contemplating and preparing a more extensive Liturgical reformation. The very first year of the new reign witnessed the repeal of the Six Articles, the publication of the First Book of Homilies, and the King's Injunctions against Pilgrimages, Images, and Obits. The same year, an Act was passed for administering the sacrament of the altar in both kinds,

^a Collier, E. H., ii. 191.

and an Order of Communion was published in English to be used after the Mass, which was still said in Latin; the elevation of the Host being prohibited. Before two years had elapsed the whole Book of Common Prayer was ready, compiled from the existing Offices, corrected from the materials brought to hand by the calling in of the ancient rituals, and the dispersion of the monastic libraries. There is reason to think also that the Greek Liturgies were not unknown. Oxford and Cambridge then rivalled the universities of Italy itself in the new learning, and there was every disposition to make use of it in the struggle with the Latin Church.

The Liturgy so compiled became, as in the primitive Church, the chief standard of Eucharistic doctrine, no less than of worship^a. The Canon of the Mass is overlaid and distorted by the definitions of the Council of Trent: but with us the Articles and Catechism, like the ancient Councils, only correct particular errors; the full exposition of sacramental teaching is formally and synodically assigned to the Liturgy:—

“The doctrine both of Baptism and of the Lord’s Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer, to be used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary^b.”

These authoritative statements amply refute the charge of abandoning the ancient and most perfect form of worship. They are no less conclusive against a notion, recently taken up, that the Church of England invites, or permits, her children to supplement her liturgical work by their own private judgment of

^a Preface to the present Liturgy.

^b Canon lvii.

antiquity. In referring to "the good fathers and godly doctors" of the primitive Church, the intention was not to endorse *every* opinion and practice of antiquity, still less to send English Churchmen to pick and choose from its multifarious stores at discretion. This office the Church claims to herself; and she has propounded the result in the Book of Common Prayer, as forming, in fact, that just temperament of antiquity, sobriety, and necessary truth, which it was her aim to secure. Whatever is not here set down, is judged either liable to objection, or at least not material or necessary. To the Church's judgment in this respect, she requires the absolute submission of her members. The canon declares it to be—

"the part of every private man, both minister and other, reverently to retain the true use of the order prescribed by public authority; considering that things in themselves indifferent do in some sort alter their natures, when they are either commanded or forbidden by a lawful magistrate; and may not be omitted at every man's pleasure contrary to law, when they be commanded, nor used when they are prohibited ^p."

The standard has undergone some modification in form, but the substance and doctrine have never varied.

The edition of 1549 was followed by a second in 1552, which the next year was replaced by the Mass, and again restored by the statute of Elizabeth in 1559. All these were in fact revolutions in the palace, acting through the authority of Parliament. The great majority of the bishops, clergy, and population, were

^p Canon xxx.

openly or secretly in favour of the Mass. Its abrogation was resented by popular insurrections, and to the end of Edward's reign the bulk of the population refused to attend the English Services. The Clergy, who were obliged to conform, sung the Service with such ingenious resemblances to the Mass, that the compilers were stung into a new edition, to correct "the curiosity of ministers and mistakers." This is their own

¶ "Because there hath arisen, in the use and exercise of the foresaid Common Service in the Church heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than of any other worthy cause, therefore as well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof, as for the more perfection of the said Order of Common Service in some places, where it is necessary to make the same prayer and fashion of Service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true knowing of Almighty God," (5 & 6 Edw. VI., c. 1). In a previous recital, the First Book is pronounced "a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the state of this realm." "And yet this notwithstanding, a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality, and living either without knowledge or due fear of God, do wilfully and damnably before Almighty God abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches," &c. These words plainly apply to the Romanists, and it is surprising that any one should be so perverse as to refer them to the few ultra-Protestant clergy who had scarcely any party in the laity, and to whom it is at the same time supposed the Second Book was intended for a concession! The compilers themselves clearly thought no alteration requisite, and reluctantly submitted to the necessity. Their language is utterly inconsistent with any change in their own views of doctrine, while every consideration of policy was *against* further provocation of the favourers of the Mass. The "curiosities" sought to be repressed are described in one of Hooper's Letters to Bullinger, Dec. 1549: "Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the Mass of the Apostles, they now have the Communion of the Apostles; where they had the Mass of the Blessed Virgin, they now have the Communion of the

account of the matter, and it is surprising that any friend of the Reformation should listen to the "popish calumny," that the Second Book was the result of a change of doctrine in the compilers themselves¹.

To a mediævalist, worshipping by the eye and the sound more than the understanding, a new Liturgy was a new religion. But it was a leading principle of our Reformation to repudiate the old confusion of ritual with religion. In place of a *Rationale* we have a "Declaration of Ceremonies," which has kept its place in every subsequent edition, repudiating the principle of doctrinal significance altogether. Religion is a matter of faith and conscience, determined by God's

Virgin; where they had the principal or High Mass, they now have, as they call it, the High Communion. They still retain their vestments, and the candles before the altars; in the churches they always chant the hours and other hymns relating to the Lord's Supper, but in our language; and that Popery may not be lost, the Mass Priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the Papacy." — *Original Letters*, Parker Society.

¹ Cranmer's "Defence of the true and Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ," could not have been written after the First Book. It was referred to by Bonner at his examination Sept. 10, 1549 (Strype's *Cranmer*, ii. 11), and in July and August the archbishop was engaged in answering the rebels. In 1547 he published the Catechism, of which he says, "not long before I was in that error of the Real Presence (meaning the Lutheran tenet), as I was *many years past* in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priest in the Mass," (Ans. to Smith, *Works*, i. 374, Parker Soc. ed.). Cranmer attributed his final conviction to the help of Ridley, who brought him Bertram's treatise in 1546, (Strype, ii. 25.) Hence, these two chief Reformers were fully agreed on this sacrament from the very beginning of Edward's reign.

law, but ceremonies are the institution of man, for "decent order and godly discipline;" their only signification is for edification. In the book itself only two rubrics are clothed with a special significance, and both disclaim any doctrinal value*. The doctrine of the Church is to be collected from the services themselves; the Calendars and Rubrics are simply "for the better direction of them that are to officiate in any part of Divine Service†."

This judicious distinction was of the greatest importance, in presence of the ritual dissensions of the times. The Protestant Reformation was nominally comprised in a few particulars. All were agreed on the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, the ministration of the cup, and the use of the vernacular language: all repudiated the papacy, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the invocation of saints and angels. Beyond this all was accounted non-essential, but the field was a wide one, and the "adiaphoristic" controversy, beginning in ceremony, tended more and more to separation in religion.

Luther led the way with a broad, contemptuous disregard of the whole question. Though the first to deny the Eucharistic sacrifice, he had no scruple in retaining the name and ceremonial of the Mass; trusting to the power of the Word, and the evangelical hymns with which he enriched the service, to maintain the truth. It pleased him to think that a Romanist, unacquainted with German, might worship God in

* The rubric for the sign of the cross in Baptism, and for kneeling at Communion.

† Preface.

a Protestant congregation without discovering the difference of ceremonial^u. His regulations at Wittenberg included the wafer, mixed chalice, altar, altar cross or crucifix, lights, vestments, incense and images. All were among his "neutral things;" retaining them for the time, he left it open to those who came after him to discontinue what they pleased. His principle was *non exigimus sed nec prohibemus*. The holy days were to him of greater importance, and he restored auricular confession and private absolution, which had been abolished in his absence^x.

Zwingli went to the opposite extreme; in the administration of the sacraments, nothing was to be added to or taken away from the express direction of Christ. His form of Communion retained only the unleavened bread, and the mixture of wine and water^y. After the sermon, a table was brought into the church and

^u "Our churches, *thank God*, are so arranged in neutral things, that a layman, whether Walloon or Spaniard, who could not understand our preaching, if he saw our mass, choir, organs, bells, chasubles, &c., would be constrained to say it was a truly Popish Church, and no difference, or but little, against those they have among themselves." Luther to Bruck, Chancellor of Saxony, April, 1541; *Briefe*, Van der Wette's ed. v. 340. For this reference I am indebted to Mr. H. R. Droop's pamphlet on the Edwardian Vestments, 1875. The mixed chalice is required in Luther's *Catechism. de Sacramento Altaris*, p. 553. Pfaff says it was afterwards omitted by Protestant Churches as indifferent, referring to Gerhard in *Locis Theologicis*, who determines that not being commanded by Christ, it is not to be obtruded as necessary.—*De Obl. Vet. Euch.*, 176.

^x "Revocata est in usum confessio auricularis et privata absolutio quam Carolostadius (called A. B. C. in allusion to his initials,) aboleverat."—Scultetus, ann. 1523, Waddington's *Luther*, ii. 51.

^y Its retention may be inferred from the universality of the mixed chalice, and the absence of any objection. It is remarkable how little is said on the subject.

covered with a cloth. The elements were placed upon it, and the minister and deacons took their place. After a short prayer, one deacon read the Institution from 1 Cor. xi., and another recited a portion of John vi. The Creed followed, and then an exhortation to self-examination. The Lord's Prayer was said kneeling, after which the minister, taking the bread in his hands, recited the Institution from the Gospels, and delivered the bread and the cup to the deacons to give to the people, who distributed them to each other. During the reception some of the discourse in John xiii. was read, and the service concluded with a thanksgiving, all kneeling*. There was no officiating vestment for the ministers, because it was assumed that Christ and His Apostles wore their ordinary habits.

This form, propounded upon higher authority than any Liturgy of man's institution, was speedily invested with a symbolism outvying anything in mediæval ritualism. It was asserted that our Lord commanded His disciples to sit at the Supper^a, in reversal of the Mosaic posture of standing, as a type of the rest attained in the New Testament, and of the marriage supper of the Lamb. Sitting was thus made part of the command, to do this in remembrance of

* Gerdesius, lib. c.; Waddington, ii. 306.

^a "The minister and congregation sat both at one table, no difference between them in pre-eminence and habit, as witnesseth Jesus Christ and the practice of the Apostles after His death. But in the papistical Mass the priests (so they will be styled) are placed by themselves at an altar. They must be clad in a several habit, whereof no mention is made in Scripture."—*Knox's Vindication*, Lorimer, p. 37.

Him : and to substitute another posture of man's device was popery and idolatry^b.

^b "The paschal lamb was eaten standing, which signified Christ yet not to be come, that should give rest, peace, and quietness. Christ and His Apostles used this sacrament at the first sitting, declaring that He was come that should quiet and put at rest both body and soul, and that the figure of the Passover from thenceforth should be no more necessary; nor that men should travel no more to Jerusalem once in the year to seek and to use a sacrament of the Lamb to come, that should take away the sins of the world."—*Early Writings of Bishop Hooper*, p. 536, (Parker Society.) "The night before He was to suffer on the morrow, eating the Passover with His disciples, He appeareth to have dissolved and disannulled the ceremony of standing, before used at God's commandment in that Sacrament. . . It is to be noted that he saith *this* Passover, as he would say the ceremony of other Passovers is here omitted; we sit as men possessed in rest, and do not stand as men having a long, desysful (fatiguing?), and tedious journey; meaning that the journey and travel of the sons of God was almost at an end in Himself, as that He doth witness in these words, Henceforth shall I not eat of it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."—(*Memorial to Privy Council*, Lorimer, p. 273.) Dr. Lorimer traces this notable symbolism through Becon and Hutcheson to John A' Lasco, who adds, "non tantum nobis commendatur consessus noster in Cœnæ Domini usu exemplo Christi Domini, mysteriique sui, quietis (inquam) nostræ hic in Christo designatione, aut futuræ olim nostræ in regno Dei gloriæ, typicâ quadam per convivalem accubitus adumbratione; sed præcipi nobis etiam prope modum mandato illo Dominico videtur, *hoc facite*. Neque enim negari potest hoc mandato comprehendere id totum quod Christus Dominus tum et docuit et fecit . . . negari sane etiam non potest accubitus illum seu consessum partem fuisse omnino actionis in ipsa Cœnæ institutione et proinde a mandato illo (hoc facite) excludi haudquaquam posse."—*Ritus Cœnæ Dominicæ in ecclesia peregrinorum*, Londini (1555), *ibid.*, p. 288. It is curious to observe how quietly these literalists slip in their "seu consessus," as equivalent to the scriptural "accubitus." If they had been told that our Lord made no change in the customary posture of the paschal supper, and that their newly-found symbolism was in fact a very old piece of rabbinical ritualism, invented to justify the long-established custom, on the ground that Israel had found rest in Canaan, they would have replied it was not so written in Scripture. They thought nothing of putting

Between these extremes Calvin advocated a middle way of ritual as of doctrine. He was ready to accept Lutheran usages, provided they were agreed to in a free synod by each particular church; what he would not submit to, was the authority of the civil magistrate, or of other churches^c. When expelled from Geneva for refusing to administer the sacrament on Easter-day, 1538, according to the Lutheran practice accepted by the State, he protested that it was not the usages, but the tyranny of the syndics, and the unchristian violence of the people, that obliged him in conscience to withhold the sacred ordinance^d.

The two elder reformers had their representatives in England, though in very unequal proportions. Calvin did not become a power till the return of the Marian

words into the mouth of our Lord, which are not only not written, but are contradictory of the historical fact. They were so persuaded of "Christ's simple Institution," that any deviation from it was to them a confession of popery and superstition.

^c Luther's contempt for the learning of his adversaries was outspoken. Averring that Zwingli had no more knowledge of dialectics than an ass, he called his party the *sacramentomagistræ*. The other retorted by avowing his dread of *grammatotyranæ*, whose only argument was, "it must be, for I say so." The German Reformer took leave of the controversy in these emphatic words, uttered within a month of his death, Jan. 17, 1546: "Enough for me who am of all men the most unfortunate, is that one beatitude of the psalmist;—Blessed is the man who has not walked in the counsels of the Sacramentaries, nor stood in the way of the Zwinglians, and hath not sat in the seat of the Zurichers."—*Waddington*, iii. 228. The controversy waxed fiercer after Luther's death, till it culminated in the misnamed *Formula Concordia*, published at Berg in 1576, from which may be drawn the final separation of the German and Helvetic Protestants into the Evangelical and Reformed Churches. Calvin became the chief authority in the latter, but in the matter of the sacraments his disciples at this day are Zwinglians, not Calvinists.

^d D'Aubigné's *Reformation*, b. xi. c. 6.

exiles, at the accession of Elizabeth. His *via media* was the very reverse of the English, who, both before and after the Reformation, regarded the authority of the magistrate as the proper end of controversy in matters not forbidden by God. Cranmer unhesitatingly declined the proffered assistance of Calvin, and though he continued to write to the Protector Somerset (who had his own reasons for reduction of ceremonial), the Genevan reformer had certainly no share in the ecclesiastical counsels of this reign, and was not a little vexed at his exclusion^e.

To Cranmer, and to Englishmen in general, Martin Luther was the apostle of the Reformation, while Zwingli, and Henry Bullinger his successor at Zurich, were unknown names. It was Luther that crossed swords with Henry VIII.; from Luther came the appellations of Protestant and Evangelical; Cranmer's personal friends were Lutherans; Oslander, his wife's uncle, who died in 1552, apart from his views of justification, was more Lutheran than Luther. The Archbishop, though relinquishing one tenet (not then regarded as seriously as it deserved), was not the man to desert his friends and connections for the opposite party. Next to Cranmer was Ridley, and Ridley, we know, took his stand on the maxim of Vincent of Lerins, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. There were some Romanists, but not one Zwinglian among the revisers of the English Liturgy.

The leaders of that school were Hooper and John Knox^f, both arriving in England in the year 1549, one

^e Collier, E. H., ii. 253.

^f D'Aubigné, vi. 228. Knox's labours in England are described, from sources but recently brought to light, in Dr. Peter Lorimer's very interest-

from a two years' residence at Zurich, the other from the French prison, which he shared with the other abettors of Beatoun's assassination. Both were extreme men and therefore popular preachers; both bitterly disaffected to the English Liturgy, and therefore of little weight with its compilers². Rejecting not only all officiating vestments, but the customary ecclesiastical habits, they boldly introduced the Zwinglian "table-gesture," and set the law at defiance. Cranmer's treatment of Hooper's scruples is well known; he was not more disposed to listen to Knox's passionate declamation.

ing Monograph, "John Knox and the Church of England." (H. S. King, 1875.) A stronger contrast to Cranmer's slow and solid progress could not be imagined, than is presented in the tumultuous career of the Scottish Reformer. A priest of Cardinal Beatoun's in 1543, we suddenly find him brandishing a drawn sword in defence of George Wishart in 1545. Rushing back the same year to join Beatoun's assassins in the castle of S. Andrew's, he was taken with the rest and carried prisoner into France. Hence he was released it is supposed, by English intercession, and being sent to preach the Gospel at Berwick, he made himself his own bishop, and had his own Liturgy. Cranmer's gentle spirit was sore exercised in dealing with a man who valued neither learning nor antiquity against his own opinion. From Bishop Tunstal's indifference and Knox's hostility, the English Liturgy seems to have been scarcely known in the diocese of Durham.

2 "I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Lord's Supper."—Hooper to Bullinger, March, 1550, in *Original Letters* (Parker Society), p. 80. In the previous December he wrote, "the Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's Presence in the sacrament, and is now very friendly to myself;" he extends the same approval to "six or seven bishops," and says it is only a fear of their property that prevents them from further reforms. He was mistaken on the doctrinal agreement, but the mistake is sufficient proof that the Second Book was a purely *liturgical* change.

A knowledge of these particulars helps us to the right judgment of the ritual legislation of 1552. The Liturgy was compiled under Catholic and Lutheran influence; it was tampered with by Romanizers on one side and Zwinglians on the other. The compilers, adhering to the principle observed in all subsequent revisions, desired to repress both. They were reluctant to make any alteration whatever, and it would have been obviously wiser to allow more time before further provoking the hostility of the clergy and people. But they had already broken with the Mass on principle, and could not submit to the imputation of a Protestantism in masquerade. The question of policy was more properly for the lay advisers of the Crown, and these were unhappily interested in another way. It is melancholy to observe, that hardly any layman took a prominent share in the Reformation without enriching himself with the spoils of the Church. The Protector Somerset enjoyed six prebends, and built his magnificent mansion from the materials of as many churches and see-houses. Northumberland, his successor in power, (who returned on the scaffold to the Pope whom he had never really abandoned,) robbed the bishopric of Durham of its lands and castles, and got the county palatine for himself. Such men had solid reasons for advocating the simplicity of Protestant worship. They had confiscated the images and other costly monuments of superstition. A good deal of plunder was still to be got from the altars, crosses, chalices, and vestments, rich with jewels and the precious metals, and they had already flown upon the spoil. The most conspicuous reduction of ceremonial—the substitution of tables for altars—was not the

work of the Second Book, but of the Crown as Supreme Head, while the First was the law of the land. It began in the very first year of its operation^h, and when resisted as illegal, the objection was thus disposed of in a Royal Mandate from the Council, headed by the signatures of Somerset and Cranmer:—

“Whereas it is said the Book of Common Prayer maketh mention of an altar; wherefore it is not lawful to abolish that which the Book alloweth: to this it is thus answered: The Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered, indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board; without prescription of any form thereof, either of a table or of an altar: so that, whether the Lord's board have the form of an altar or of a table, the Book of Common Prayer calleth it both an altar and a table. For as it calleth an altar, whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered, a table and the Lord's board, so it calleth the table, where the Holy Communion is distributed with lauds and thanksgivings unto the Lord, an altar, for that there is offered the same sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And

^h Hooper writes to Bullinger from London, June 25, 1549: “the altars here are in many churches turned into tables.”—(*Original Letters*, Parker Society.) Hooper reckoned too much on Cranmer's agreement with himself. The next year he was sent to the Fleet for refusing to wear the episcopal habit, without the option of refusing the bishopric. His friend Foxe was sadly scandalized at his submission; “as a new player in a strange apparel he cometh forth on the stage. His upper garment was a long scarlet *chimere* down to the foot, and under that a white linen rochet that covered all his shoulders. Upon his head he had a geometrical, that is a four-squared, cap, *albeit that his head was round!*”—(E. H., book xi.) This “mathematical cap with four angles, dividing the whole world into four parts,” was quite as grievous to the “godly” as the discarded mitre.

thus it appeareth that here is nothing either said or meant contrary to the Book of Common Prayer¹."

This first of Privy Council Judgments unquestionably declares the law of our Church, though when its argument was repeated by Laud on the other side, the Puritans rejected it with indignation. Having served the purpose of substituting tables for altars, it was thrown aside, and the change was paraded as a denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is certain, however, that in Scripture and antiquity the two names are interchangeable, while the form and material are variable and indifferent. Cranmer and Ridley hoped to "move the simple people" from the Mass by a further change of ceremonial; they had yet to learn that such needless assaults on religious associations are the surest means of defeating reform. These sacrilegious acts revolted the heart of the nation, and prepared a joyful welcome for the restoration of the Mass². Meantime

¹ "Reasons why the Lord's Board should rather be after the Form of a Table than of an Altar," sent with the King's Letter to Ridley, Nov. 24, 1550 (Foxe, E. H., book ix). The Letter recites, "that the altars within the most part of the churches of this realm had already been taken down," which is extremely improbable, as it could only be done by the authority of the Ordinary, and the Letter itself shews that it was objected to as illegal. The probability is, that the altars remained, though despoiled, in the majority of the churches to the reign of Mary.

² Only a year later, Mary's easy victory over the "Twelfth Day Queen" was greeted with astonishing demonstrations of delight. In London, the citizens spread tables in the streets: there was free feasting for all comers; social jealousies and religious hatreds were forgotten for the moment in the ecstasy of the common delight. (Froude's History of England.) The Bills for the restoration of Popery passed the House of Commons by enormous majorities.

they increased the difficulty of dealing with the ultra-Protestant disturbers. Few as these men were in number, and utterly opposed to the national feeling, they had protectors in the Council, who pressed the revisers hard. However willing to part with the altar and its vestments, they were resolved not to acquiesce in the table-gesture of John Knox^k; neither would they dispense with an officiating vestment. The First Book allowed the cope instead of the proper Mass vestment, the chasuble. In now abrogating both, the revisers retained the primitive white linen, the oldest of sacrificial vestures, and the first we hear of in the Christian Church. They persisted in the appellation of "priest," as well as in requiring him to officiate standing, not at the head but at the side, of the table, corresponding to his former position "in the midst afore the altar^l." The communicants, too, were still to receive the consecrated elements from his hands, singly and on their knees.

^k Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer spoke of the "altar" to the last; and the name is retained not only in common parlance, but in the Coronation Service and several modern statutes (59 G. IV., c. 134, s. 6; 2 and 3 W. IV., c. 61).

^l This direction of the First Book excluded the frivolous movements from one part of the altar to another, which disfigured the old services. The Second Book excluded the table-gesture of the opposite extreme. The table being turned the contrary way from the altar, Knox would have taken the *head* (as the Presbyterians now do), and seated the communicants on either side. This the Second Book forbade, requiring the priest to stand, as before at the altar, and the people to kneel. The "north side," in the then position of the table, answered to the "afore the altar" in the other, and the same is still the meaning of those two rubrics, though as our tables now generally stand the former is impracticable. Both meant the middle of the front of the table, whichever way the front might face. No change from side to "end" was ever authorized.

When the Second Book appeared with these provisions, the indignation of the Zwinglians was great. Knox denounced them in his most vigorous strain. A memorial was got up to the Council, after the Act was passed, and Cranmer was commanded to re-consider the point, with the assistance of Ridley and Peter Martyr, the Zwinglian Professor of Divinity at Oxford. The archbishop obeyed, but declined to depart from the provisions of the Book. He desired their lordships not to be moved by "these glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy."¹ To say that "whatsoever is not commanded in the Scripture is against the Scripture, and utterly unlawful and ungodly," he affirmed to be the error of the Anabaptists, and "a subversion of all order as well in religion as in common policy." With unusual warmth he continued,—

"Whosoever teacheth any such doctrine, I will set my foot by his *to be tried by fire*, that his doctrine is untrue, and not only untrue, but also seditious and perilous to be heard of any subjects." If it was not said in Scripture (he added) that Christ ministered to the Apostles kneeling, neither was it said standing or sitting, and "we shall rather receive it lying down on the ground, as the Tartars and Turks use yet at this day; and the words of the evangelist import the same, which signify properly to lie down upon the floor or ground, and not to sit upon a form or stool^m."

All that the Council could do was to add the Declaration for kneeling (since designated the Black

^m This important Letter was first printed from the Public Records' Office, in the Rev. T. W. Perry's "Historical Considerations on the Declaration on Kneeling," London, 1863. I quote it from Knox's warm and intelligent admirer, Dr. Lorimer, p. 105.

Rubric) which, not being part of the Book authorized by Parliament, was excluded from the revising statute of Elizabeth, and did not appear again till the last reviewⁿ. Of this Declaration Cranmer is thought to have been the writer. It has been often cited in proof of doctrine, but it was in fact a protest against the doctrinal significance of mediæval and Zwinglian ritualism. The revisers, adhering to their rule, refused to consider the question on any other ground than that of decency and reverence.

The archbishop's firmness was an unexpected disappointment to the Zwinglians, whose views were espoused by his chaplain, Thomas Becon. They supposed themselves released from the entire altar ceremonial, by the substitution of tables, and this introduction of a rubric for kneeling (which was not in the First Book), with another officiating vestment, brought them again under the yoke. They had the further mortification of being required to subscribe to the new ceremonial.

Along with the Second Book came out the Forty-two Articles, of which the Thirty-fifth declared the Liturgy to be "godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeable thereto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little." All the efforts of Knox and his friends were ineffectual to procure the withdrawal of this article. He advised his followers to yield to the power of the magistrate if the Book should be enforced on them; but

ⁿ The words "real and essential," which in 1552 were meant to include both the Lutheran and the Tridentine tenets, were then replaced by the more exact word "corporal."

he refused to accept a benefice with the obligation to conformity°. His admirers justly claim for him the name of father and founder of English as well as Scottish Puritanism. Certainly no one did more to defeat the cause for which Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer laid down their lives. The compilers who escaped the fires of Mary, found him their unrelenting foe at Frankfort and Geneva, and his teaching may be credited with a large share in the subversion of the Church and Monarchy at the Great Rebellion. On the further "chapters of history" anticipated for Puritanism in the future, this is not the place to speculate^p.

The subject is here dealt with as shewing how little the revision of the Liturgy was under Zwinglian influence.

Equally unfounded is the conjecture, originated by the Nonjurors at the beginning of the eighteenth century, that the revisers were unduly biassed by the

° At the close of his life Knox boasted that he had refused an English bishopric. The evidence is only a letter from Northumberland to Cecil, saying that Knox was a great obstacle to the use of the Liturgy in the north, and his residence brought a number of Scots there whose presence was objectionable. The writer wishes the king would appoint him to the bishopric of Rochester, where he would be "a whetstone to quicken and sharp the Bishop of Canterbury, and a great confounder of the Anabaptists in Kent." The suggestion reads like a jest; and no more is heard of it, except that the duke, still pressing for his removal out of the north, withdrew his patronage after an interview, in which the stern reformer probably told him some home truths. The Council eventually asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to give him the vicarage of All Hallows, Bread-street, which Knox refused from conscientious objections to the Liturgy (Lorimer, p. 175). The serious part of Northumberland's letter was his scheme for plundering the bishopric and deanery of Durham.

^p See Lorimer, p. 161.

"foreign Protestants," Bucer and Martyr. It is true that those two divines were consulted, and their suggestions are extant^q. So little conscious, however, was either of the authority ascribed to them a century and a half later, that we find Martyr complaining to Bucer that the archbishop "did not tell him the alterations determined upon, and he durst not take the freedom to enquire^r." In point of fact, these two divines were on different sides in the controversy of the day. Martyr gave no little umbrage to the other by his denial of the Real Presence at Oxford^s. Bucer was a Lutheran, and had been employed with Melancthon on Archbishop Herman's Consultation, to which the English Liturgy was so largely indebted. It was by his persuasion that the Reformed congregations of Strasburg and the neighbourhood united with the Germans at Wittenberg, to the great annoyance of their Swiss neighbours^t. Like Melancthon, and most of the English divines, Bucer considered the difference to be one of phraseology more than doctrine. He was constantly promoting conferences, with the view of merging the controversy in general expressions, which

^q Burnet's History, part ii. book i. Collier, E. H., part ii. book iv. Bucer's animadversions were divided into twenty-eight chapters, to which Martyr signified his entire concurrence.

^r "Conclusum jam est in hoc eorum colloquio, quemadmodum mihi retulit reverendissimus, ut multa immutantur. Sed quænam illa sint, quæ consenserint emendenda, neque ipse mihi exposuit, neque ego de illo quærere ausus sum."—Strype's Mem. Cran., II., App. No. lxi.

^s See the Sententious Sayings of Master Martin Bucer upon the Lord's Supper, *ibid.*, No. xlvii.

^t Mosheim, E. H., cent. xvi. a. iii. p. 9, ii. 5.

each side might interpret in its own sense. Hence he cordially embraced Calvin's explanation at the synod of Berne, 1537 :—

“The spiritual life which Christ gives consists not only in making us alive by His Spirit, but in rendering us, by the power of His Spirit, partakers of His life-giving Flesh, and by means of this participation nourishing us for eternal life. Therefore, when we speak of the communion which the faithful have with Christ, we teach that they receive the communication of His Body and Blood, no less than that of His Spirit, so that they possess Christ wholly. The Spirit nourishes us with the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, and thus quickens us for immortality. Christ offers this communion under the symbols of bread and wine to all those who celebrate the Supper aright, and in accordance with His Institution.”

Bucer, denying that he ever held a local Presence, added,—

“Calv., Op., ix. 711. See D'Aubigné's “History of the Reformation,” book xi. c. 6, English translation, vol. vi. 394. The venerable author “almost hesitates to report the words, because they will be difficult to comprehend.” Dr. Maclaine frankly declares that “Calvin certainly went too far in talking of really eating by faith the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ.” (Translation of Mosheim, E. H., iv. 351.) The English Presbyterian, Dr. Lorimer, with a truer appreciation of “the highest and richest Helvetic sense,” persuades himself that John Knox was “entirely of Cranmer's mind” in the doctrine of the Eucharist, (Lorimer, p. 129). It is singular that the most logical of all the reformers, the clear, incisive Frenchman, whose dialectics neither halted nor quailed before the *horribile decretum* of Predestination, should be thus treated by his followers. Other leaders have been outrun by their disciples, but the Calvinists have been engaged in running away from Calvin. They seem to value his Eucharistic doctrine as lightly as modern Wesleyans esteem John Wesley's.

"The Presence of Christ by faith is not a mere logical Presence, not imaginary, as when I say, for instance, that I now see my wife at Strasburg: faith requires something higher than that. When I say with you that Christ is present in a heavenly manner, and with Luther Christ is present in a substantial manner, I express fundamentally one and the same 'faith'."

These expressions effected a temporary truce. Language which could be accepted not only by Luther and Megander, but by divines of the later Roman obedience, could secure no lasting agreement*. Bucer suffered, like other peacemakers of this kind, the censure of both sides. The Zurichers refused to have anything to do with the "Strasburg trimmer," and he had no little difficulty in obtaining the forgiveness of his own communion†.

* D'Aubigné, p. 391.

† Luther expressed great delight at Calvin's explanation, and said that if the Swiss would adopt it there was an end of the controversy, (D'Aubigné, xi. 15). Bossuet (*Variations des églises Protestantes*, ii. 8, 14, 19) and Courayer (*des defeutes des Théologiens*, ii. 72) consider it almost the same as the Roman Catholic. This damaging approval is attributed by Dr. Maclaine to Calvin's "obscurity and inconsistency" (!). The truth is that Calvin was here speaking of the glorified Humanity, which Lutherans and Romanists confounded with the sacramental Body and Blood. D'Aubigné records the distinction (without observing it), when he says that "Calvin, like Zwingli (?), regarded the bread and wine as pledges, that Christ gives to the believer (in reception) His crucified Body and His shed Blood, that is to say, communicates to him the expiatory virtue of His death. . . . But he differed from the reformer of Zurich, in that he saw in the Supper a mysterious union with the glorified Person of Christ. With good reason he said the bread is called Body, since it not only represents Him (as dead), but also presents Him to us (alive)."—Ibid.

‡ Luther's reception of him was not polite, even if in jest: "A Bucero

In pursuance of the same policy of ambiguity, Bucer suggested the omission from the English Liturgy of whatever might breed disputes between Protestants, and to some extent this suggestion was entertained. The omission meant liberty, not prohibition. Where there was no law there could be no transgression; and Cranmer, who made it a conscience to enforce the law, was not disposed to be too minute in ritual legislation.

Such was the real principle of the liturgical omissions and relaxations of the Second Book¹. That the principle was carried too far, is clear from every subsequent recension having restored some of the provisions of the First edition². At the same time, it is in substance the Second that has secured the final approval of the reformed Church of England. The Liturgies of Edward VI. were both issued by royal and parliamentary authority, more than ecclesiastical. The action of the Crown was not greater than in other similar instances; but being reversed before the Church had time to acquiesce, the effort failed for the time, and is now only a matter of history.

Being resumed at the accession of Elizabeth, and

autem salutat, subridens aliquantulum respondit, tu es nequam et nebulo." (Scultetus, An. 1529. Waddington's "Church History," ii. 380). Even Melancthon suspected his sincerity, and Justus Jonas said he possessed the cunning of a fox, which he wished to be taken for sagacity and prudence.

¹ All the manual acts were omitted; there was no direction to set the elements on the table, nor to take them into the priest's hands. If all these were prohibited, there could be no consecration; but there *might* be adoration, since the rubric forbidding elevation was also omitted!

² The Scottish and American recensions go further in this direction than our own.

canonically confirmed under her successor, the Liturgy then obtained an ecclesiastical sanction never enjoyed by the state formularies of the Tudors. It is in the existing Liturgy of 1662, however, that we now hear the voice of the Church. Combining the deliberate and final utterance of the English Church and State, its authority is to us sole and complete. It is clearly too late, after two centuries more of happy and fruitful obedience, to rake together all the cavils of Romanists, Nonjurors, and Puritan Calvinists, in order to bewail the loss of our "Catholic inheritance," and seek it again in the "authority of parliament" during the opening years of King Edward VI., Supreme Head of the Church and clergy of England.

The true standards of comparison are the Catholic Liturgies of the purest ages; and it has been abundantly shewn that our own will bear comparison with the best^b. The defects imputed to it are either in ceremonial, or verbal expression, or the order of the several prayers, neither of which can lay claim to any primitive or Catholic prescription. The Oriental Liturgies differ from the Western, and from each other. Uniformity was never the rule even within the same patriarchate. In England, besides the great provincial Uses, there was much diversity of local ritual in cathedrals, abbeys, and other churches. The new thing, in fact, was the attempt at a national uniformity. Called for, as it undoubtedly was, by the increasing unity of the nation after the Wars of the Roses, it was so managed by the bigots of the law as

^b It is enough to refer to Sir W. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*.

to be the cause of continual strife and alternate persecution for two centuries. The settlement of 1662 must have been again overthrown, but for the alternative of Dissent, granted shortly after for political reasons^c.

Our Liturgy has been injured by carelessness, and hampered by political and sectarian bigotry; but when allowed to speak for itself, it loses nothing by comparison with any other, ancient or modern. No serious question can be raised on altars, vestments, lights, or incense. The holy Table is an altar in the sense of the early Church and our own. Both names (as we have seen) were indiscriminately used by the Fathers and the Reformers: there is no hint of any particular material or shape being requisite, or universal. The Mosaic altar was of wood, square and portable. The altar in Solomon's Temple was larger, fixed, and elevated on steps, but of the same material^d. In the second Temple it was smaller, and of unhewn stone^e. All were probably hollow frames covered with a grating, and perhaps filled up with earth^f. Indeed, the ground

^c The penal character of the Uniformity Acts under Charles II., for which the Church has been reproached, was due to the House of Commons. The Bishops and the Crown wished for a power of dispensing with tender consciences, but the House remembered the tyranny which the country had suffered under that pretence, and was resolved to shew no mercy. The lay mind (though often latitudinarian in doctrine) is always more intolerant in ritual than the clerical; a phenomenon not unfrequent in the British parliament.

^d It is called the brazen altar, but the brass was doubtless nailed on a wooden frame.

^e Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, V., v. 6.

^f *Exod.* xx. 24. Cain and Abel sacrificed doubtless on the ground; Gideon on a shelf of rock (*Judges* vi. 20); on the same they took their own food.

itself was the primitive altar, as it was the primitive table; whence, when Solomon's vast structure proved insufficient for the victims, he recurred to the primæval use, and consecrated a part of the pavement ^g. The elevated altar, like the elevated table, was merely the growth of civilization. The sacrifice was God's food, ordained, as Bishop Patrick observes,—

“to represent His dwelling among them in the sanctuary, where this daily sacrifice was the constant provision made for His table (as the altar is called), and bread and wine a necessary attendant, as they are at all tables, upon the meat that was set before Him ^h.”

Athanasius and Augustine speak of wooden altars, and these were probably in general use till the tombs of the martyrs were resorted to.

The position and aspect of the priest and people are mere incidents of the altar. The Levitical priests probably officiated at all four sides of the altar; the people being on the east, looking westward to the mercy-seat behind. The high-priest when presenting the remembrance within the vail,—the highest act of sacrifice,—stood in like manner before the ark, with his face to the west, and the people behind him in the court outside. The Jews in the captivity still worshipped towards the mercy-seat; and the early Christians towards the east, as typical of Christ the Sun of Righteousness, the day-spring from on high ⁱ. Their

^g 1 Kings viii. 64.

^h Commentary, Exod. xxix. 40.

ⁱ Mal. iv. 2; Luke i. 78; comp. Jer. xxiii. 5, and Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, where the Hebrew word *tsemach*, “a branch,” is rendered by the LXX. *ἀνατολή*, “the east,” or as we read in S. Luke, “day-spring:”—“We

churches, therefore, were usually built with the altars at the east end, and the entrance at the west; but this arrangement was not universal. We know that the cathedral at Tyre^k (like the present S. Peter's at Rome) followed the precedent of the Temple, in having the entrance at the east: the people faced the altar wherever it was. In England, the orientation of churches appears to have been more strictly observed. Our Liturgy assumes the Table to be at the east end, but there is no trace of doctrinal significance. The priest naturally stands before it, but like all other matters of ceremonial, it is only for decency and convenience.

The same is affirmed of vestments in the reformed Church of England. They have no "holiness or special worthiness, but are simply for decorum, gravity, and order^l." The high-priest's garments of glory and beauty were *official* rather than *officiating*; they were laid aside in the Real Presence of the inner sanctuary^m. Nothing but white is named in the Christian Liturgiesⁿ. The mediæval vestments, pall, cope, stole, cha-

worship towards the east, not as if we thought God more peculiarly dwells there, but because God is in Himself the True Light, and is so styled in Scripture."—Athanas. ad Antioch, quæst. 37.

^k Euseb., E. H., x. 4. In this description the altar is *ἐν μέσῳ*, not perhaps in the centre of the building (as now at S. Peter's), but in the middle of the western choir. This may be inferred from its being termed "the holy of holies;" but the altar was not necessarily against the further wall, like the ark; there may have been an apse behind it, where the bishop officiated, with his face to the east and to the people. This is supposed to have been the Basilican arrangement.

^l Can. 74.

^m Lev. xvi. 4.

ⁿ See *supra*, Clem. Lit., p. 265. Eusebius (E. H., x. 4) mentions the sacred *ποδῆρη*, which, like the *λαμπρὰ ἐσθῆς*, was doubtless of clean

suble, &c., were beyond question articles of ordinary costume, retained and enriched according to the taste and means of the Church: they differed greatly in colour, shape, and material, and there is no pretence for calling any of them primitive or Catholic°.

As for the name of the Mass, it was retained in the First Book as the common appellation of the Eucharistic Office. Being neither primitive, Catholic, nor intelligible, it would be an intolerable affectation to continue a barbarous Latin appellation for an English act of worship.

The objections to the arrangement and verbal expression of the service may deserve more attention.

white linen. The orator further alludes to a "heavenly diadem," but whether material or otherwise is not very clear. Such an ornament is ascribed to S. John, S. James, and S. Mark, (E. H., iii. 24, with Valesius's note).

• Notwithstanding the cloud of conflicting legal opinions, which have lately obscured the question, I adhere to the historical view of Sharp, L'Estrange, and the best Church commentators, who regard the "Ornaments Rubric" as imposing one uniform vesture for ministers of the Church "at all times of their ministration." The revived Ornaments of the second year of Edward VI. do not include the vesture prescribed by the rubrics of the first *Eucharistic Office*, which is not retained in the existing Liturgy, but only those specified in the "Certain Notes and Explanations" at the end of the Book. By the present rubric these are to be worn "at all times of their ministration," superseding the distinction of copes in cathedrals (Canon 24), by a uniform vesture of surplice and hood: the cap and tippet or scarf (lately called in error a stole), belong to the canonical habit (Can. 74). By the same rule the Eucharistic vesture of alb and vestment, appointed for the bishop in 1549, is withdrawn, and he is to officiate "at all ministrations" in cope and surplice, beside his rochet. The chimere is a cope, but our bishops generally omit the surplice. The pastoral-staff has lately been revived, forgetting, that being no longer delivered at consecration (as it was in 1549), it is as obsolete and unauthorized as the mitre.

In examining it, we must bear in mind the diversity in detail, no less than the substantial agreement, of the ancient Liturgies. Six elements have been observed in all, of which four, Commemoration or Institution, Oblation, Benediction, and Communion, occur in an invariable order. The place of the other two, Thanksgiving and Intercession, is different in different Liturgies. It is not denied that all six are found in our present Liturgy: the complaint is that the Oblation is less perfectly expressed than in the First Edition.

This is just the point which the sacrifice of the Mass had so terribly perverted, and it would be strange if the Reformers, in the first recoil from a great abuse, had hit the true medium more accurately than the Revisers of 1662, after a century of argument. It must be borne in mind that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is properly the whole action of the celebration, shortly called the "Eucharist" and the "Sacrifice," and in later times the "Sacrament," and the "Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ." This commemorative oblation of His death,—termed also the oblation of His Body and Blood, and the oblation of Christ Himself, the Lamb slain for our sins, (all meaning the same thing),—is not limited to any particular moment or prayer. It pervades the entire service of Thanksgiving, Benediction, and Communion. Hence S. Augustine's remark, that to "eat bread is the sacrifice of Christians," and even Bossuet could see that Communion is itself an oblation ^p.

^p *Supra*, p. 113. See, too, Dr. Redman's death-bed testimony in Foxe, *E. H.*, vi. 268: "The school doctors, saith he, did not know what *consecratio* meaneth. It is *tota actio*, all the whole^t thing done in the ministry

The material oblation is purely symbolical, and the proper place for it is before the consecration, which constitutes the Body and Blood for Communion. The oblation of the gifts after consecration is the peculiar error of the Roman Missal, and conjoined with the corporal presence effects the grand corruption of the Mass, which the Reformers before all things were determined to abolish.

When the question is reduced to the ritual oblation of the gifts, the comparison is entirely in favour of the present Liturgy. In the first place, the lay-oblation, the foundation of all the rest, is wholly absent from the First Book. The offertory was made a reality by an actual collection of alms, but they were offered to the poor men's box, without being presented for the Divine acceptance. Again, the sacramental elements, then provided by the priest, were simply set upon the altar with no verbal oblation whatever. No doubt the action alone is sufficient, since nothing else is recorded of the Levitical sacrifices¹. Prayers and hymns, we know, accompanied the ritual action, but it was the action, not the words, which constituted the sacrifice. Still, when we find the verbal oblation li-

as Christ ordained it; that is, *consecratio*." It will be remembered that Redman was one of the compilers of the Liturgy. Strype strangely calls him "a papist," which of course he once was; but he died in his prebendal house at Westminster, in the communion of the Church of England. He was Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and "one of the learned men of his time."—Strype, *Mem. Cran.*, ii. 270.

¹ "Opinions will differ as to whether this can be properly called a priestly act; that it is generally regarded so, may be gathered from the fact that those Reformed Bodies who have no priests, have discarded the act of oblation in the Holy Eucharist."—Drake's *Teaching of the Church during the First Three Centuries*, p. 134.

mitted exclusively to the prayers, and the petition to accept and bless the gifts struck out, we are obliged to infer that no material oblation was intended. In fact, it was an apprehension that the act might be so construed, by the "curiosity of ministers and mistakers," that induced the compilers to omit this rubric from the Second Book. Though not of Luther's opinion on the Presence, they were largely influenced by his denunciation of material sacrifice.

The point was better understood in 1662, and in our present Liturgy, the "New Oblation of the New Testament," is full and distinct. The alms and other devotions of the people are reverently brought to the priest, and by him humbly presented and placed upon the Lord's table; "for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Then the sacramental elements, now again restored to their proper character as the gifts of the parishioners, are brought in like manner by their representatives, and by the priest placed upon the Holy Table^r. These ritual acts are followed by an express verbal oblation, in which all three—alms, oblations, and prayers—are solemnly offered to the Divine Majesty. This is every way superior to the meagre, hesitating attempt of the First Book. The improvement is sometimes obscured by mistaking the oblations for the "other devotions" referred to in the rubric, and omitting the word when the sacramental gifts only are offered^s. Bishop Patrick, who was contemporary with

^r Canon 20. This observance corresponds with the great Entrance of the Oriental Liturgy, and it is a pity the Canon should be overlooked in preference of the credence table, which has no reference to lay oblation.

^s The Scottish rubric may afford some ground for this error, though

the last revision, points out the true meaning of this familiar liturgical term :—

“If you observe the time when the bread and wine is ordered to be placed upon God’s table, which is immediately after the alms of the people have been received for the poor, you will see it is intended by our Church to be a thankful oblation to God of the fruits of the earth. And accordingly, all that are there present, when they behold the priest thus preparing the Bread and Wine for consecration to a higher mystery, should secretly lift up their souls to God in hearty thanksgiving, and offer Him the sacrifice of praise for these and all other such benefits. . . . And so we are taught to do in that prayer which immediately follows, . . . wherein we beseech Him to accept not only our alms but also our oblations. These are things distinct; the former (*alms*) signifying that which was given for the relief of the poor, the latter (*oblations*) can signify nothing else but (according to the style of the ancient Church) this bread and wine presented to God, in a thankful remembrance of our food, both dry and liquid (as Justin Martyr speaks), which He, the Creator of the world, hath made and given unto us^t.”

The error here corrected has been encouraged by the printers inserting a semicolon into the middle of the sentence, whereby the oblation is separated from the accompanying petition for the Spirit, and the emphatic word “offer” is reduced to a mere redundancy. The pause ought to fall at the word “prayers,”

the verbal oblation agrees with our own. Our own rubric is perfectly clear; the “other devotions” are offerings for the clergy, the fabric, or any service of God, *except* the relief of the poor. It is a strange scruple that can allow an oblation of *money*, and refuse the name to the sacramental gifts to which it most properly belongs.

^t Christian Sacrifice, part ii.

the relative that follows comprehending all three antecedents—alms, oblations, and prayers,—and the participle “beseeching,” depending on the verb “offer.” Thus, if the ordinary rules of grammar are observed, the whole comes out in its true sense as a genuine oblation:—

“ We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers; WHICH WE OFFER unto Thy Divine Majesty, beseeching Thee to inspire the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord.”

This is in complete accordance with the ancient petition to send the Holy Ghost on the Church and the Gifts, though the latter is reserved for more particular mention at a later period. Our offertory prayer is in fact the beginning of the *anaphora* (or canon). The oblation of the gifts is followed by the Intercessions, and the thankful commemoration of departed souls, which is another of the restorations at the last review. Then, at a later stage, the priest recites over the *oblata* (τὰ προκείμενα), so lying on the altar, the perpetual memory of the cross, perfecting the consecration, not by the bare words of Institution, but by prayer that in receiving them according to His Institution, we may be partakers of the most blessed

“ There is no authority for the priest to disconnect the verbal from the actual oblation, by removing to another part of the Holy Table. The rubric contemplates no change of posture, or position, between the presentation and the prayer, and it is contrary to principle to introduce one. It would be as reasonable to sign a child with the cross at the font, and remove into the desk to declare its admission into the Church. The manual act and the verbal expression must in all reason go together.

Body and Blood, which those undying words disclose. Here is the oblation of Christ's death, offered as Mede expresses it ^x, not subjectively in the elements, but *objectively* to the Divine contemplation, as the one "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." It is the appointed pleading of the New Testament Covenant ^y.

It is true that this culminating point of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is separated from the opening of the *anaphora* by an unusual amount of intervening matter. The Greek Liturgies also interrupted the continuous prayer of primitive times, by addresses, ejaculations, and responses, meant to quicken the attention of the

^x See *supra*, p. 214. Though Bishop Morton was probably the "learned prelate" referred to (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 81, p. 92), the word is not found in his "Catholic Appeal for Protestants," (London, 1610), nor in his Latin *Apologia*. It may be Mede's own term for expressing Morton's doctrine; a solution for which I am indebted to the Rev. H. R. Bramley, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford, who kindly sends me the following parallel expression, in regard to the other sacrament: "We are buried by Baptisme in His (that is, Christ's) death, naming baptisme a buriall; can this be expounded properly? Is it not plainly the like figurative phrase, where the signe, (that is, the dipping in the water) carrieth the name of Christ's buriall (which is the object of Christian faith) and the spirituall matter signified thereby."—*Cath. App.*, p. 125.

^y "It cannot be denied (we might almost say that before Mr. Jowett it never was denied) that the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper speak most distinctly of a sacrifice, 'Drink ye all of this, for this is My Blood of the new covenant,' or to follow S. Luke, 'the new covenant in My Blood.' We are carried back by these words to the first covenant, to the altar with twelve pillars, and the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings of oxen, and the blood of the victims sprinkled on the altar and on the people, and the words of Moses as he sprinkled it, 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you.'"—(Abp. of York's Essay on the Death of Christ, *Aids to Faith*, pp. 327, 8.)

worshippers. These are expanded in our Liturgy to an extent that, if burdensome to the frequent and intelligent communicant, was probably no more than was required, when the obligation to Communion had been lost sight of in hearing Mass. And there are still those who need to be reminded of the spiritual and subjective element, against the increasing attraction of the outward action. It is the special function of the living Church to provide for such varying needs of the people. The nature and extent of the changes made will best appear from extracting the Prayer of Consecration, as it stood in the First Book, only numbering the paragraphs for the convenience of reference :—

1. "O God, Heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, Who made there (by His one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to celebrate a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again: Hear us, (O merciful Father,) we beseech Thee;

2. "And with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ:

3. "Who in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread*: and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat; This is My Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance

* *Here the Priest must take the Bread into his hands.*

of Me. Likewise after supper He took the Cup^a; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins: Do this, as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of Me.

“ These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people.

4. “ Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesu Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the Memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same;

5. “ Entirely desiring Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the Merits and Death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.

6. “ And here we offer and present unto Thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ; and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy Son Jesu Christ, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him.

7. “ And although we be unworthy (through our mani-

^a *Here the Priest shall take the Cup into his hands.*

fold sins) to offer unto Thee any Sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service [and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy angels, to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of Thy Divine Majesty^b,] not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord; by Whom and with Whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen."

This was beyond question a very noble prayer, and a vast improvement on the Canon of the Mass. Besides expunging the rubrics (which in that Office are more corrupt than the words), it expanded the whole recital, after the manner of the ancient models, and in particular introduced a prayer for the Spirit to bless the gifts, of which the Roman Canon was destitute. Still, when this formulary is held up as our Catholic inheritance, and our present Office is disparaged as mangled and misplaced, it is necessary to remind the

^b These words, taken from the Roman Canon, are here distinctly restrained to the prayers. They were omitted from a reasonable doubt whether this office is properly to be ascribed to the *angelic* ministry: the ancient Liturgies attributed it to the mediation of Christ. The petition seems to have been based on the action of the Levitical priests, who carried the memorials from the great altar of sacrifice into the holy place, and burned incense on the golden altar before the vail. The smoke of the incense ascending within, at the same time with that of the sacrifice without, was symbolical of the prayers of the people. Compare Luke i. 10, and Rev. viii. 3, 4. There is no trace in Christian antiquity of this Levitical symbol being conjoined with the oblation of the Eucharist. In the visions of S. John the incense indicates the acceptance in heaven of the services below; it is a confusion of the imagery to unite a literal use of the material perfume with the spiritual sacrifice. The incense belonged to another altar, and finds its antitype in the mediation of Christ.

unwary that, in every one of the portions altered, the Office of 1549 was entirely *new and unprecedented*. The effect and meaning must be considered in detail.

The first paragraph remains unchanged in the existing Liturgy. The second was removed in 1552, possibly in consequence of Bucer's animadversion. Bucer's objection, however, was not to the petition for the Holy Ghost, but to the remainder of the clause, which, being a translation of the Roman *ut fiat nobis*, might be twisted, he feared, to the support of the Corporal Presence. The objection was futile enough; as Archbishop Laud observed, "it were for the good of Christendom if this were the worst error in the Mass." Nevertheless, this construction was actually attempted by Gardiner, and Cranmer's answer was as follows:—

"We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the Body and Blood of Christ, but that *unto us*, in that holy mystery, they may be so: that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood, and that therewith, in spirit and in truth, we may be spiritually nourished."

This, he adds, was always the meaning of the petition in the ancient Liturgies. It is clear, then, that in substituting this very explanation of Cranmer's in the second edition, the Reformers gave expression to their original meaning, and the present petition is practically equivalent to the other.

It is true that the petition for the Spirit disappeared in the change, and the omission may well be regretted; still, in stigmatizing this loss as a "mutilation" in violation of all liturgical precedent, it is overlooked,

first, that no such petition is found in the Roman Canon, nor in any of the Western Offices framed on its model; and secondly, that, as inserted in the Office of 1549, the petition did *not* accord with the Invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Eastern Liturgies, either in form, substance, or position. The difference was enough not only for its own authors to abandon it in 1552, but to induce Johnson to denounce it as "imperfect and preposterous," and the Nonjurors to reject it from their New Communion Office of 1718.

Dr. Brett censures it as

"a plain deviation from Catholic practice; for whereas in all the ancient Liturgies, except the Roman, the words of *Institution*, the *Oblation*, and the *Invocation*, always follow one another in the order I have named them; in this Liturgy the last is put in the first place, and God is petitioned to bless and sanctify the elements by the Holy Ghost, before we have recited the words of Institution, and thereby declared or set forth our commission and our duty to perform that service."

It is true the Doctor thinks this mistake "by no means so material as the total exclusion of the Invocation;" but it was a mistake which could only be remedied by substituting the Eastern form of consecration for the Western; and that was a greater change than our Reformers were prepared to attempt. Hence, when the difficulty came to be felt, they determined to omit the petition altogether. It is certain that the action of the Holy Ghost is implied in all consecration, and if the omission of an express peti-

• Dissertation, p. 383.

tion for His blessing be a liturgical loss, it is one which all the churches of the Roman obedience suffer with us, and which the Church of England has only escaped during the three famous years when her Liturgy was ruled by the first impressions of King Edward VI. and his advisers.

The third paragraph is still retained, and with it, in all reasonable construction, the prohibition of elevation, though not now expressed in the rubric^d. The fourth was omitted, and the remainder transposed to the post-Communion.

These alterations, which appear to have excited little or no discussion at the time, were certainly not suggested by Bucer. There is no trace of them in his animadversions, nor a particle of evidence to impugn their being the unbiassed determination of the English Reformers^e. Neither do we hear of much debate at the accession of Elizabeth, when it was determined to restore the Second Book, with modifications, in preference to the First.

^d The original object of the elevation was to present the sacrament to God, not to exhibit it for the adoration of the people. It was probably derived from the "heaving" of the offering before the Levitical altar, and designed to symbolize the petition that God would receive the remembrance to His altar in heaven. The order for the people to worship the uplifted host was first made by Honorius III., A.D. 1222, and obviously occasioned by the new tenet of transubstantiation. It was the first thing prohibited at the restoration of the Communion in both kinds (1548), before the Latin Missal was abolished. The omission of the rubric from the Second Book was certainly not designed to remove the prohibition, and its continued omission at the last review only shews the entire cessation of the practice.

^e Some discussions took place in Convocation, of which no particulars are extant.

The first expression of dissatisfaction was heard at the compiling of the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, when, against the advice of Laud, it was resolved to revert to the Office of 1549, as more truly expressing the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The issue of that experiment was not such as to encourage its renewal at the Restoration; but in the next century the Nonjurors revived the complaint of there being no proper oblation; and Wheatly, who had but little liturgical lore, went so far as to stigmatize the present arrangement as a "mangling and displacing" of the Office. These complaints have been lately reiterated with greater bitterness, and less discrimination.

The chief grievance is the omission of the fourth clause of the Consecration Prayer of 1549. This is called in the Scottish Liturgy the *Memorial*, or *Prayer of Oblation*; but not only is the word "oblation" not in the original, but whoever compares the clause with the corresponding portion of the Roman Canon, must perceive that this word was precisely what was *rejected*. The Roman Canon, as we have seen, contained *two* verbal oblations of the elements, both of which were omitted in the Liturgy of 1549. Of the first, before consecration, the petition remained for the sanctification of the Spirit, but all words of oblation were carefully eliminated. The second, after consecration, was altogether omitted, and a new form substituted in its place. The words of the Roman Canon are, "We offer unto Thy glorious Majesty, of Thine own gifts and presents, a pure host," &c. The English runs, "We do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the Memorial

which Thy Son hath willed us to make," &c. The words "offer" and "oblation" are scrupulously expunged; and it is impossible to compare the English with the Latin, and not see that the oblation of the gifts was the very thing rejected. And with good reason, for this oblation of the *consecrated* elements was, in fact, the peculiarity of the Roman Canon, and the foundation of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

It is true that in the Greek Liturgies the oblation followed the words of Institution, but it was followed in turn by the Invocation, which effected the consecration. Indeed it was *in order* to the benediction, implored in the Invocation, that the oblation was made. In the oblation the bread and wine are but symbols; the Invocation makes them the Body and Blood, and of these *communion*, not oblation, is the only use that remains.

In the Western Church, where the consecration into the Body and Blood was held to be perfect on the recital of the words of Institution, the oblation was necessarily thrown back to an earlier stage; and the second oblation of the Roman Canon was an error, arising from a corrupt following of the Eastern Office. This error, when coupled with the later mistake of transubstantiation, gave birth to the sacrifice of the Mass;—a dogma resisted by our Reformers even to the death. To avoid it in the English Liturgy, they changed the second oblation into a Memorial; and when "the curiosity of ministers and mistakers" rendered further "explanation" necessary, they expunged the clause altogether. As matters stood, this was the wisest thing to do. In a liturgical point of view the

clause was erroneous as well as novel. The "memorial" is the name of the *oblata* before consecration, and is not so properly applicable to the holy gifts after the benediction, in virtue of which they are to us "verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ." To insert the word in this place was, in fact, to peril the reality of the consecration, seeing that nothing followed to change the symbolical into the real.

This grave consequence is overlooked by those who now want to return to the "Memorial" of 1549, in a sense disclaimed by its authors. It has severely exercised, however, those who from time to time have endeavoured to restore the oblation. The Scotch Liturgy of 1637 made an oblation out of the "Memorial," by interpolating the new title, "Prayer of oblation." Even so, the oblation was the whole sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, together with the reasonable sacrifice of bodies and souls, not the material gifts; for, as we have seen, this is not the proper place for offering the gifts, and in fact they are actually offered at an earlier part of the Scotch Liturgy.

The Nonjurors found the confusion was only to be remedied by altogether abrogating the arrangements of 1549. In their "New Communion Office," after reciting the words of Institution, the priest proceeded thus:—

"Wherefore, having in remembrance His Passion, death, and resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven and second coming with glory and great power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works, we offer to Thee our King and our God, according to His holy institution, this bread and this cup ;

giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast vouchsafed us the honour to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice unto Thee. And we beseech Thee to look favourably on these Thy gifts which are here set before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient God; and do Thou accept them to the honour of Thy Christ; and send down Thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the Passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ; that they who are partakers thereof may be confirmed in godliness," &c.

Here we have a clear, unambiguous oblation of the gifts, but they are offered before consecration as "bread" and "cup;" and these names are continued in the following clause, where the Holy Ghost is invoked to make them the Body and Blood. The *sacrifice* is distinctly of the bread and wine, not of the Body and Blood, and the Tridentine Mass is thus effectually excluded. But then not only is the Liturgy of 1549 wholly discarded, but the doctrine of the Western Church, with regard to consecration, is abandoned for the Eastern, and the words of Institution are denied the power of effecting the Sacramental Presence.

A similar result was arrived at in the revision of the Scotch Liturgy made in 1765^f. This Office agrees with the English up to the sermon, except that in place of the Ten Commandments it is permitted to substitute a Summary of the Law taken from Mark xii. 29—31. After the sermon, the materials are for the most part taken from the English, but entirely

^f I am indebted to the present Bishop of Aberdeen for an authentic copy of this Liturgy, as collated by Bishop Horsley, and attested by Bishop Skinner, for the information of Parliament, A.D. 1792.

re-arranged. The presbyter, (as he is called,) on returning to the altar, begins with our long Exhortation; then follows the Offertory, in which the word "alms" is omitted; the devotions are termed "oblations," and they are presented upon the holy table with the thanksgiving in 1 Chron. xxix. 10—12, 14. After this, the presbyter is to "offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the sacrament upon the Lord's Table;" but for this, the true oblation of the Eucharist, no words are provided. The Service goes on with the *Dominus vobiscum*, *Sursum corda*, *Vere dignum*, *Preface*, and *Ter sanctus*. Then comes the Prayer of Consecration, and then that for the whole state of Christ's Church, omitting the words "militant upon earth," and with an amplification of the concluding clause. The Lord's Prayer, the short Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, Comfortable words, and Collect of humble access, precede the Communion, in which only the first half of the English words of distribution is retained. The post-Communion consists of our second Collect of thanksgiving, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, and the Benediction. The concluding rubrics, in the printed copies now in use^s, sanction the mixing of the chalice *before it is presented on the altar*, and direct a reservation of the consecrated gifts for the communion of the sick, aged, and infirm, who could not be present; the remainder is to be reverently eaten and drunk after the Blessing. The prayer of consecration opens with the words,—

"All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly

^s These rubrics were not included in Bishop Horsley's Collation, or in the attestation of Bishop Skinner, 1792.

Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender Mercy, didst give Thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our Redemption; Who (by His *own* Oblation of Himself, once offered,) made a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a Perpetual Memorial of that His Precious Death and Sacrifice until His coming again. For in the night that He was betrayed He took bread," &c. (as in our own Liturgy.)

After the words of the Institution, the priest proceeds with the "Oblation," as follows:—

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy Dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do Celebrate and Make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy Holy Gifts, WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE, the Memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to Make; having in remembrance His Blessed Passion and Precious Death, His Mighty Resurrection and Glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same."

The Invocation:—

"And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and, of Thy Almighty Goodness, vouchsafe to Bless and Sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most Dearly beloved Son."

This completes the Consecration: the celebrant proceeds:—

"And we earnestly desire Thy Fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept This our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving;

F f

most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the Merits and Death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy Whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. And here we humbly offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee, beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the Most Precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be filled with Thy Grace and heavenly Benediction, and made one Body with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him.

“And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins,” &c. (as in our post-Communion Office.)

This form of consecration has been adopted in the “Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America ^b,” (1789,) with the verbal correction of

^b The late Bishop of Illinois (my esteemed friend Dr. H. J. Whitehouse, whose lamented death is announced during the preparation of this edition,) supplied my copy of this book. I have since been favoured with a copy of Bishop Seabury's “Communion Office,” (1784) republished at New York by the Rev. Samuel Hart, M.A., Professor in Trinity College, Hartford, U.S. This office, which is almost identical with the Scottish, was introduced by Seabury on taking possession of the diocese of Connecticut, and extensively used previous to the adoption of the American Prayer-book. Professor Hart gives an interesting sketch of this proto-bishop of the United States, with some valuable notes on his office. The present Bishop of Connecticut, Dr. J. Williams, (at whose suggestion I undertook this enlarged edition,) has also obliged me with an interesting facsimile of a Concordat between the Scottish bishops and Bishop Seabury, dated Nov. 15, 1784, providing for “a brotherly fellowship between the Episcopal Churches in Scotland and Connecticut,” and the use of the Scottish Liturgy in both.

own to *one*, and with the alteration in the Invocation of the words that "they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son," to the English form, "that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His Death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood¹." The Scottish expression, it will be observed, is more absolute than the Roman Canon itself (*ut fiat nobis*); still it relates to Communion only, since no other use of the gifts is authorized, and the *doctrine* of that Church is identical with our own and the American.

It should be observed that, both in the Scottish and American rubrics, the manual action of the celebrant is used, as in our own, along with the words of Institution, but it is *not* repeated (as in the Nonjuring Office) at the Invocation, which completes the consecration. The Scottish and American Churches, while exchanging the Western doctrine of Consecration for the Eastern, have not recurred to the First Book of King Edward VI. In their Office the "Memorial" is a true oblation, which it was not, and could not be, in the Book of 1549. The "holy gifts" are offered as bread and wine, and they continue to be so called down to the end of the Invocation, when they are sanctified to become the Body and Blood to the receivers. The whole prayer is thus at once primitive and consistent. Nothing can be said against it, but that it involves a wider separation from the

¹ With the exception of the Consecration Prayer, the American Office is nearly the same with the English of 1662: it omits, however, the references to John vi. and 1 Cor. xi. in the Exhortation.

Churches of the Roman obedience than has been deemed necessary in England. The Scottish and American Churches, being in full communion with our own, can have no intention to impugn the validity of our Eucharistical consecration, yet it is a serious reflection for ourselves, that if the words of Institution do not effect the presence of the Body and Blood, there are no others in our Liturgy, or in the *Roman Canon*, to constitute the sacrament at all ^k.

In removing the remaining petitions from the Consecration Prayer to the post-Communion, the Reformers (who must be allowed to know their own meaning) "explained," beyond question, that no oblation of the consecrated gifts had ever been intended. The "bounden duty and service" of the seventh clause is the whole celebration, the "unbloody sacrifice" of the early Church, and is most appropriately presented when the rite is completed by communion. So, too, the reasonable sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, is most suitably offered when we have verily and indeed received the Body and Blood of Christ, and are so united with Him in the Sacrifice of the Cross. This self-oblation is a rich addition to the Anglican Office, not found in any ancient Liturgy, but expressing, in a less questionable form, the thought

^k The Concordat mentioned in the last note declares that "between the First Book of Edward VI. and the form used in the Church of Scotland, there is no difference in any point which the primitive Church reckoned essential to the right ministration of the Holy Eucharist." That this declaration is equally true of the present English Liturgy follows from the unbroken unity of the two Churches, and is further proved by the use of the English Liturgy in the Church of Scotland itself, concurrently with its own.

which Cyprian aimed at in his fanciful exposition of the mixed chalice.

On the whole, the pretended "mangling and displacing" of the older form not only gave the true interpretation of its own meaning, but resulted in a feature which is not sufficiently appreciated. The great and happy peculiarity of the English consecration is, to advance the Communion of the people along with that of the priest, into the heart of the *anaphora*¹. It is impossible to sever the sacrifice from the sacrament for a single moment. By delaying the words of Institution to the very end of the Consecrating Prayer, and then following them (without another word) by the Communion of priest and people *as one act*, the whole is incorporated into the oblation. The Body and Blood are no sooner presented in remembrance before God, than they are partaken of by the faithful. The Priest does not return to the Table till all have communicated^m; then resuming the *anaphora*, he and they complete the consecration,—not of the gifts but of themselves,—in the most explicit words of sacrifice. This order not only conforms exactly to the rule of

¹ In the Liturgy of the Scottish Church the order after consecration is nearly the same with Bishop Seabury's. The American Church reduces the interval by adhering for the most part to the English Order; still, there is a long prayer after the words of Institution, which in some degree separates the oblation from the Communion, or as the Romanists say, the sacrifice from the sacrament. Our own Liturgy is the only one that gathers the entire act into one focus, delaying the words of Institution to the close of the prayer, and immediately following them with Communion, which, as Bossuet acknowledges, is itself a kind of oblation.

^m Rubric:—another proof that none but communicants are present.

S. Ambrose, by which the names of bread and wine are to cease after consecration—a rule disregarded in all other English Liturgies—but reproduces the original type of the evangelists and Justin Martyr, where nothing is found between the words of Institution and the reception of the sacrament. That dangerous interval, into which so many superstitions have been crowded, is finally suppressed, and the presence of non-communicants made impossible.

In the Lutheran service, also, the Words are followed by instant communion, but with a totally different view. The Words are recited in the distribution of the elements, and the breaking of the bread is simply for reception. In our Liturgy both are included in the prayer of Consecration, to be said (as the old rubric ran) “turning still to the altar, without any elevation or shewing the sacrament to the people;” that is, they are parts of the sacrifice, and by immediate participation take up the Communion with them. The fraction is for the commemoration before God of the Body sacrificed on the cross. There is a *second* breaking for the communicants, and then the sacrifice is resumed and continued in the self-oblation of the worshippers now incorporate with Christⁿ. This exactly

ⁿ From overlooking this double breaking of the bread, it has been supposed that the direction in our rubric to “break the bread before the people,” means that the people are to *see* this first symbolical fraction, as well as the necessary distribution to themselves. This mistake is the only ground for questioning the unambiguous words, “before the table,” in the same rubric. The priest’s position, according to the rubric, is at once “before the table” and “before the people;” and this must of necessity be between the two. The north end is not before the table, but *beside* it. In that position the table is before the priest, but

expresses the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Fathers, though the words are taken from the Scripture rather than

the priest is not before the table. It is obvious also that the people would see the sacrament *better*, if the priest stood in the middle before the table, and turned towards them at the fraction, than when he is apart at the north end. Accordingly some have adopted this explanation: but besides involving a similar ostension of the cup, for which there is no direction, it brings us into direct collision with the express prohibition against shewing the sacrament to the people, and the Article, that it "was not ordained to be *gazed upon*." The Church is not chargeable with these inconsistencies: her direction is to break the bread not only before the table, and before the people, but also during the Consecration Prayer, which all allow is to be said with the face towards the table. It is part of the Remembrance before God of the sacrifice of the Death of Christ. This fraction is, in fact, a peculiarity of the English Liturgy introduced at the last review. It was not in the Book of 1549, nor in the Roman Mass; and Sir W. Palmer has not found it in any ancient Liturgy, with the single exception of the Alexandrian as used by the Coptic Monophysites, (Orig. Liturg., iv. 19). It is a typical allusion (he observes) to Christ's Body, *broken* for us (1 Cor. xi. 24); but as His Body was not literally "broken" on the cross, (John xix. 36,) and the word is not found in the best MSS. of the Epistle, it may be better taken as symbolizing the concurrent sacrifice of the Body *mystical*, which is also signified in the bread. This would explain why the words, "before the people," are limited to the *bread*, to the exclusion of the cup, which should equally be shewn to them if that were the meaning. It is the bread which more particularly represents the Church incorporate with Christ (1 Cor. x. 17). The Fathers often speak of it as a sacrament of our living sacrifice, in union with the shewing of the Lord's death. Both are first shewn to God by way of memorial, and afterwards distributed to the people in Communion.

The revisers of 1661 were more likely to follow the Fathers than the Lutherans, and we may be quite certain that in making this fraction accompany the Prayer of Consecration, they had not forgotten their own words at the Savoy Conference: "The minister turning to the people is not (as the Presbyterians alleged) most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks *to* them, as in Lessons, Absolutions, and Benediction, it is convenient that he turn to them; when he speaks *for* them to God; it is fit that they should *all* turn another

any of the known Liturgies°. Finally, we conclude with the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which was at the beginning of the Liturgy of 1549, as in the Ordinary of the Mass, but more nearly represents the paschal hymn in its present place. An arrangement possessing so many practical advantages, and so obviously closer to Scripture than any other, is little affected by the frigid objection, that it is "liturgically unique." The Roman Canon is unique. The First Book of Edward VI. was unique. The Scottish and American

way, as the ancient Church ever did." It follows that he and they are all to turn towards the table throughout the Prayer of Consecration, the priest being at once before the table and before the people, i.e. *in front* of both. This is the natural unsophisticated reading of the rubric; it says nothing about the people seeing the fraction: the bread is to be broken in their presence, *in facie ecclesiæ*, as part of the rite, and not beforehand, out of the church, in the slovenly way which is still too common. It is broken in front of them, as on their behalf. The preposition is constantly used of place alone, without the slightest reference to *aspect*; as the front rank of a regiment stands "before" the rear-rank. So Moses stood "before the people" at the rock of Horeb (Exod. xvii. 5), and the ark of the covenant went "before the people" into Jordan (Josh. iii. 6, 11, 14), and the armed men marched before the priests, and the priests that blew the trumpets before the ark (Josh. vi. 13); and the Good Shepherd goeth before the sheep (John x. 4). See also 2 Chron. xx. 5, where the Speaker's Commentary has "in this (court) the people were assembled, and Jehoshaphat prayed in front of them," all looking towards the altar, and the mercy-seat beyond it. The king was thus at once before the Lord, and before the people.

* We may compare Greg. Naz. in Apologetico, *ὅτι μηδὲς ἄξιός τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ θύματος καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρίστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν*, from which words Pfaff conceives that our petition was framed. The same, he adds, is implied in the prayer of Chrysostom's Liturgy, offering the Unbloody Sacrifice, and beseeching God to send His Spirit, *ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*, on the worshippers and on the gifts. Pfaffius, Not. in Iren. Fragm., p. 117.

compromises are unique. If the ancient Churches had been restrained by so puerile a scruple, there would have been no "families of liturgies" to collate.

A far more serious accusation is the alleged discontinuance of the original matter of the sacrament,—unleavened bread and the mixed chalice. It is true that these are not prescribed in the present Liturgy, as they were in the First edition, and the omission may be justified from the acknowledged authority of the Church, with respect to such incidents of the Institution as are not essential to the commemoration. The Paschal Supper of our Lord differed in many points from the first Passover in Egypt; and no one thinks the Church bound to observe every incidental particular of the first Eucharist. If unleavened bread were used only because no other was available at the paschal season, there would be no obligation to retain it, any more than the recumbent posture, or the evening celebration. It cannot be shewn that the absence of leaven was regarded as an integral part of the sacrament^p. On the contrary, many deny that the original bread was unleavened, holding the Last Supper to have been kept before the Passover; and the whole Eastern Church insists on leaven as indispensable to the character of bread^q.

^p The only Scriptural allusion is in 1 Cor. v. 7, which to a Gentile Church is certainly of some weight; yet there was a powerful Jewish element in the Corinthian Church, and the Epistle was probably written at the Passover. The Armenians in the fourth century pleaded Apostolical tradition for unleavened bread, but the general voice of the East was against it.

^q Some derived *ἄpros* from *ἀρῶ*, referring to the "rising" of the leaven (Scudamore, *Not. Euch.*, p. 751); but as Greek was not the language of the Institution, the etymology, if correct, is irrelevant.

Moreover, Card. Bona proves, against Baronius and the Schoolmen, that the Western custom is not older than the eleventh century, and that for the thousand years before the bread was universally leavened^r. His conclusion is confirmed by the well-known fact, that the sacramental elements were originally taken from the oblations of the people, and the bread was consequently such as they had to offer. Our Reformers were abundantly justified, when restoring this privilege to the parishioners, in removing a restriction for which there is no primitive or really Catholic authority.

The English Church thus escaped from the Western yoke, but without coming under the Eastern. There was no prohibition of unleavened bread, but only a declaration that ordinary bread "should suffice^s." In fact, there was then no sort of objection to unleavened bread: it was retained not only by Luther, but by Zwingli and Calvin, and is still the use of some Non-conformist congregations in England. It was the *form* of the Host, with its elevation and adoration in the Mass, that the early Reformers justly disliked. The First Book of Edward VI. not only prohibited these actions, but required the bread to be made thicker and larger, so as to be broken in communion, and without the emblems stamped upon the wafers^t. No question was raised about *leaven* one way or the

^r Rer. Lit., i. c. xxiii.; Bingham's Antiquities, xv. 2, s. vi.

^s Compare the Baptismal rubric: "it shall suffice to pour water," &c.

^t Wafers were complained of at their first introduction in the eleventh century, as "foreign to the appearance of true bread," (Scudamore, p. 748). They are not recommended by the symbolism which makes them represent the thirty pieces for which Judas sold his Master, or the true "penny" to be given to the labourers in the Lord's vineyard. On the other hand, see Exod. xvi. 31; xxix. 2; Lev. ii. 4.

other; and so little was the Second Book thought to require it, that one of Elizabeth's first Injunctions renewed the direction for unleavened cakes, and Archbishop Parker expounded the words, "it shall suffice," as a toleration not a command, adding, that "the most part of the queen's subjects disliketh the common bread for the sacrament^a." Wafer-bread, in fact, continued to be the rule of the stricter Churchmen down to the Great Rebellion; the Puritans, after their usual manner, inveighing against it as a relic of popery. Hence the present rubric seeks to guard against "dissension" as well as superstition; still it nowhere withdraws the liberty previously enjoyed. There is no prohibition either of wafers or leaven; the "best and purest wheat bread" is required, and no more. Undoubtedly a single loaf, "one bread^x," is every way more agreeable to the Institution than a number of wafers, or pieces of bread previously cut up, whether leavened or unleavened^y. It may be

^a Strype's Parker, iv. 3; see also Hooker, E. P., iv. x. 1: "Have not they (at Geneva) the old popish custom of administering the blessed sacrament of the Holy Eucharist with wafer-cakes? Those things the godly there can digest; wherefore should not the godly here learn to do the like?" When Grindal put the same question, he was answered, that the English congregation at Geneva had loaf bread. This points to John Knox as the author of the innovation. Common bread was one of the superstitions of his table-gesture in England; Calvin retained the unleavened cake, though he accounted it "Judaic." On the other hand, I have myself met with more consistent literalists among the laity, who insisted on communicating in unleavened bread as the ordinance of Christ.

^x 1 Cor. x. 17.

^y Laud's "Troubles," p. 342. Wafer-bread was the rule under Queen Elizabeth. James I. ordered it for his son's chapel at Madrid, and Bp. Andrewes used it in the Chapel Royal. Laud, though never using it himself, knew it was occasionally in use at Westminster Abbey.

questioned whether such several pieces are consistent with the direction introduced at the last review, to "break the bread." This is the true objection to wafers. It would be deplorable, indeed, in the present position of the English Church, to embroil her in the controversy so unnecessarily dividing the two great families of Christendom, which touch her on either hand².

The mixed chalice stands upon much higher ground. It was not only used in the Institution at the Last Supper, but everywhere retained in the Christian commemoration. It appears in the very earliest account of the celebration³, and in the Liturgies of all

² "Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partie de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre."—(De Maistre, *Considerations sur la France*, ch. ii.)

³ According to all the Jewish authorities, the rule was not to bless the paschal cup till water had been put into it, (Berachoth, f. 50, 2; Pfaff, 174). Maimonides says that pure wine was to be poured in, and the mixture take place in the cup, (*De Sacrif. Pasch.*, ix. 4; Scudamore, 351). Lightfoot, with others, hold the mixture not to be *obligatory*, which is no more than is held of the Christian chalice, but no reason has been suggested why our Lord should have neglected the proper rule of the observance. Mr. Malan, indeed, referring to Isaiah i. 22, asks if He can be supposed to have blessed a cup which the prophet treats as adulterated? It is certain, however, that both Jews and Christians did suppose this, and deemed it the proper rule of the sacred feast; and they were not ignorant of Isaiah. Dr. Vogan is equally irrelevant in suggesting that the Corinthian wine was strong enough to intoxicate the communicants. There is no evidence that it was the *Eucharistic* cup that produced this shocking result, and if it were, the strength of the wine would not be affected by the few drops of water required. It is an assumption without a particle of proof, that the object of the water was to dilute the wine. This could *not* have been the object with the drink-offerings poured on the altar, and it is far more probable that it was always a symbol of *purifying* with blood.

Churches, East and West^b, with the single exception of the Armenians, who were condemned by a General Council for omitting it^c.

There is nothing to object against the early and general belief, that it represents the Blood and water that flowed from the Saviour's side on the cross. In like manner, the Apostle speaks of water along with the blood of the elder covenant^d, and we have reason to believe it was mixed with the wine of all the drink-offerings under the law^e; still there is no authorized signification in the water. All agree that the wine is the sacrament of the Blood, and the omission of the water does not affect the validity of the celebration^f. As a matter of Church order, it would be highly inconsistent in a Church appealing, like our own, to Catholic antiquity, to discard one of the few relics of primitive agreement. Nothing short of express Scripture, or some grave local difficulty, could justify such

^b Justin Martyr, *supra*, p. 259.

^c Conc. in Trull., *supra*, p. 247.

^d Heb. ix. 19; comp. Exod. xxiv. 6.

^e Quæst. Hebr. in Paralip., l. xi. 50; Pfaff, p. 174; Scudamore, p. 350; see also Prov. ix. 2, 5.

^f Thomas Aquinas says the Armenians were not censured for omitting the water, which was a fault of discipline, but for the heresy of denying the lawfulness of the mixture, (Summ., p. 3, qu. 74, Art. 7; p. 2, qu. 83, Art. 6.) The Armenians, as early as the fourth century, pleaded Apostolical tradition for unmixed wine; and a passage has often been quoted from Origen's Homilies (in Jerem. xii.) to the effect that "Jesus rejoices His disciples with unmingled wine." It may well be doubted, however, if this refers to the Eucharist. It is also said that the ancient Irish Church did not use the mixture, because it is not directed in the Missal; but no such direction is found in the Greek Liturgies, the chalice being mixed beforehand. Such exceptions, so far as they go, prove that the mixture was not essential; and this is universally allowed.

a separation from the rest of Christendom, and as neither is pretended, we have no right to fasten this reproach upon the Liturgy by implication.

The mixed chalice was retained by all the early Reformers, though without esteeming it a matter of obligation, as in the Church of Rome. It was prescribed in the oblatory rubric of the First Book, and there is not the slightest indication that it was discontinued by the omission of that rubric in the Second Book. The rubric was a large one, comprehending the oblation of the elements, together with the use of the "*corporas*, paten, or other comely thing" for the bread, and the "chalice or some fair and convenient cup" for the wine and water. No one will contend that the simple omission of this rubric amounted to prohibiting proper vessels for the elements, or setting them on the Table; neither then did it prohibit the mixed chalice. There is not the slightest hint of any dispute about it at the time. The rubric, which sought to "take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the bread and wine," had nothing to say upon the cup: it did not even say that unmixed wine "shall suffice," as it did of usual bread. It was plainly not in controversy, and no reason can be suggested why it should be. Bucer, to whose censure the omission of the rubric has been ascribed, has not a word against the mixed chalice, which was his own use as a Lutheran. What he objected to was, the solemn oblation of the elements and the sanctity thereby ascribed to them, and there is no doubt that the omission was to humour this scruple.

The omission continued till the last review (when the formal oblation was restored), but was never thought to preclude the mixed chalice. Nothing else (as far as we know) was used in the reign of Edward VI. and the early part of Queen Elizabeth. It must have been generally neglected, under Puritan influences, in the time of James I., since Cardinal Perron then reproached the Church of England with the omission. Bishop Andrewes replied that it was not a matter worth standing on, one way or the other, but that we should not "stick to put as much water as the Romanists did ^g," obviously implying there was no prohibition. In fact, it was the regular use of the Chapel Royal all the time that Andrewes was Dean, and he gave directions for it in consecrating churches. It appears also in the King's orders for the Prince's Chapel at Madrid. Bishop Cosin says ^h, "our Church forbids it not, for aught I know, and they that think fit may use it, as some most eminent men among us do at this day." The rule had then practically become the exception, and the Commonwealth nearly extinguished it. The revisers of 1662 did not enforce it when they restored the oblatory rubric. By requiring only bread and wine, at a time when the omission of the water was known to prevail, they certainly tolerated the unmixed chalice, and we are bound to suppose the Church was justified in yielding to scruples too obstinate to be resisted. Still, there is no word of censure on the scriptural and Catholic usage ⁱ, and no hint approving of the Puritan aberration.

^g Ans. to Perron, c. xviii.

^h Notes on C. P.

ⁱ "The mixture of the cup is no more forbidden in our Church at this day than in the times of Andrewes and Laud."—Robertson, "How shall

According to the ancient Liturgies, "wine" in this connexion means, as it did in the First Prayer-book, the proper sacramental mixture. If the strained constructions, which modern lawyers are seeking to put on the Act of Uniformity, be held to prohibit the mingling during the service, as "another rite," it is to be observed, that the mixing is no part of the action ascribed to our Lord in the Gospels, nor to the celebrant in Justin Martyr's account. The cup was already mixed when presented for the benediction; and this was also the usage of the Eastern Churches, and seems to be contemplated in the Scottish Rubric^k. Even in this island, then, where it is now sought to reduce the Anglo-Catholic Liturgy to a mere schedule of an Act of Parliament, the law may still perhaps permit us to prepare the chalice before the service begins, and what Christian can be offended at partaking, with the universal Church, of the cup which Jesus Himself consecrated for the Remembrance of His most Precious Blood?

It is hardly necessary to add that there is no authority for the assumption of some modern writers, that our Lord's words, "fruit of the vine¹," exclude the

we Conform to the Liturgy" (1843), p. 107. So also Sir W. Palmer: "No custom can be more canonical, and more conformable to the practice of the Primitive Church. In the English Church it has never been forbidden or prohibited; for the rubric which enjoins the priest to place bread and wine on the Table, does not prohibit him from mingling water with that wine."—*Orig. Lit.*, c. iv. s. 9.

^k "The Presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table." (1792.) One of the later rubrics says, "It is customary to mix a little pure clean water with the wine in the Eucharistic chalice or cup, when the same is taken from the Prothesis, or credence, to be presented on the altar." (1866.) The same custom is found in Bishop Seabury's Communion Office.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 29.

admixture of water. If this expression were literally pressed, it would be to the advantage of the total abstinence, more than the Armenian, heresy. So far from favouring any Roman error, the mixed chalice is a strong testimony *against* transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass, being another witness to the commemoration of the Cross^m.

The last objection to be noticed is the omission of departed Christians from the Eucharistic Intercessions. No one pretends to include such intercessions in the original Institution. Neither do they occur (like the mixed chalice) in the earliest accounts of the celebration. That our own Church considers prayer for the dead *unlawful* cannot be proved, in the absence of any canon, article, or rubric to that effect, and in the teeth of the statute affirming the doctrinal purity of the Liturgy which prescribed it.

On the other hand, it is equally impossible to contend for its being "material or necessary" to the Eucharist, in the face of the original Institution, and the language of the Fifty-seventh Canon of our own Church. It is, as it always was, a question of Church order. Wherever such intercessions have been used, they were varied at the discretion of the bishop; and why may not the living Church close the diptychs altogether, as well as enter or expunge particular names? There is a time to speak and a time to keep

^m S. Cyprian's theory of the water, though widely followed, is hardly to be called *exegesis*; and the others are simply illustrations: the only universal exposition of the mixture is based on John xix. 34; suggesting that the mixed cup of the Passover represented the Blood of the Lamb. Comp. 1 John v. 6, and Heb. ix. 19.

silence. Sometimes a seeming defect in form is required, to redress the balance of a truth violently disturbed from an opposite quarter. It is precisely for this ever-varying duty that the Church "hath power to decree rites and ceremonies." The power is the same in one century as in another, and is to be exercised for edification in all.

The original object of such prayers, we have seen, was to exercise communion with the departed saints, as equally living in Christ with their brethren upon earth. They indicated a deep sense of the reality of the spiritual life, and the impossibility of its being quenched in deathⁿ. The benefits expected were those that flow from the intercession of faith: when these became exaggerated, on the one side into a mediation of the saints in heaven, and on the other into masses upon earth for the deliverance of souls from purgatory, it was high time to reconsider the practice. Sir W. Palmer well observes on this head:—

"The true justification of the Church of England is to be found in her zeal for the purity of the Christian faith, and for the welfare of all her members. It is too well known that the erroneous doctrine of purgatory had crept into the Western Churches, and was held by many of the clergy and people. Prayers for the departed were represented as an absolute proof that the Church had always held the doctrine of purgatory. The deceitfulness of this argument can only be estimated by the fact that many persons at this day, who deny the doctrine of purgatory, assert positively that the

ⁿ "Nec piorum animæ mortuorum separantur ab ecclesia, quæ etiam nunc est regnum Christi. Alioquin nec ad altare Dei fieret eorum memoria in communicatione corporis Christi."—*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 9.

custom of praying for the departed infers a belief in purgatory. If persons of education are deceived by this argument, which has been a hundred times refuted, how is it possible that the uneducated classes could ever have got rid of the persuasion that their Church held the doctrine of purgatory, if prayers for the departed had been continued in the Liturgy? Would not this custom, in fact, have rooted the error of purgatory in their minds? If, then, the Church of England omitted public prayer for the departed saints, it was to remove the errors and superstitions of the people, and to preserve the purity of the Christian faith. . . . The happy consequence was, that all the people gradually became free from the error of purgatory. . . . And when the doctrine of purgatory had been extirpated,¹ the English Church restored the Commemoration of saints departed in the Liturgy, which had been omitted for many years from the same cautious and pious regard to the souls of her children²."

In fine, necessary truth and local Church authority are *all* that was ever really requisite to a Catholic Liturgy. The first of these conditions is certainly wanting to the Roman Canon, as expounded by the Council of Trent. The Anglican Liturgy, fulfilling both, is in every respect as Catholic as any of the old Greek or Latin, and more so than most of their modern representatives. When we add that it comes the closest of any to the standard of Holy Scripture, it is not too much to pronounce it the best and truest in the world.

Twice purified in the scorching fires of the Reforma-

¹ Palmer's Orig. Liturg., c. iv. s. 10. The "Commemoration" is contained in the last clause, added to the Offertory Prayer in 1662, where the supplications of the ancient Liturgies are condensed into the brief petition that we *with them* may be partakers of the heavenly kingdom.

tion and the Rebellion, it is now stamped by a national acceptance of two centuries, as the great religious settlement of the English people;—the deed of union between Church and State at home;—the heart's bond of countless wanderers in foreign lands;—and the daily manual of our mission Churches throughout the world. The old Romish taunt of isolation has passed away; the Liturgy, once stigmatized as the peculiarity of a little island, now reverberates in many languages, and gathers at this day around the throne of grace more Christian souls than any other, to “the most perfect form of adoration to the Almighty.”

To disturb this settlement would be to shake English Christianity to the foundation, and break up the great Anglican Communion throughout the world. Hence all parties in Church or State have been wont to deprecate above all things any alteration in the Liturgy. Yet what but alteration is aimed at, when repealed formularies are commended in preference to existing ones? or when it is attempted to over-ride the present ritual with the provisions of pre-Reformation canons? Such suggestions are incompatible with a loyal subscription to the existing Liturgy, and with the express declaration of the Fifty-seventh Canon. The only questions that can be now honestly raised are questions of interpretation on the Book of 1662; and of these it must be remembered that the Liturgy does not consist merely of the words prescribed to be uttered, but of the whole action of the sacramental service. The Church's doctrine, and the national settlement arrived at in the Book of Common Prayer, may be even more vitally affected by variations in the

method of celebration, than by an alteration of the prayers themselves. Hence the Church retained the all-important power of interpretation in the hands of the bishops, from whom originally emanated the liturgical legislation. It was provided that,—

“Forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.”

Unhappily this power has been too little exercised, and in the growing passion for litigation, it is now swallowed up in the Courts of law. The Courts, however, have no power to declare the mind of the Church: they simply pronounce on the legal penalties incurred by the accused. The reasons which guide their decision have no authority in the conscience; they are of no value whatever out of England, and it is open to any one at home to challenge a new decision on his own case. The Bishop speaks for the Church; he is entitled to canonical obedience, his authority binds the conscience. For no Catholic rule is more certain, than that a priest cannot celebrate divine offices against the will of the Bishop, without sin.

To talk as some now do of “the liberty which has

in such matters been always allowed to the clergy and people," is to gainsay the most notorious features in the history of Catholic Liturgies, and of our own in particular. To the "old godly doctors" such a "liberty" would have appeared preposterous. Who can fancy a priest of the "most pure and uncorrupt ages" proposing to S. Basil (for example) to enrich his Liturgy with some alleged ante-Nicene use? or astonishing S. Chrysostom by exchanging his surplice for the last and most authentic edition of the Clementine "splendid garment?" What would S. Athanasius have said to an invitation, from some Alexandrian Church Union, to try the legality of lights and incense before a count of the empire? Or how would S. Cyprian have dealt with a priest of Carthage taking the liberty to carry an "olive leaf" to Pope Stephen?^p

Such extravagancies, however congenial to the democratic spirit of the nineteenth century, have neither parallel nor sanction in the Catholic Church. They could not be tolerated, even if it were certain that the Eucharistic Liturgy would be improved by the uncontrolled action of each aspiring priest. For obedience is better than sacrifice: no Liturgy is so lovely

^p The "Olive Leaf" is the title of a little book relating the self-imposed mission of an English clergyman to the Pope of Rome and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, for a reconciliation of the Churches. Armed with a certificate of character from the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and attired in a monastic garb, this quixotic pilgrim gained admission to the Roman pontiff, and was received with his usual affability. How much was known of his "mission," either to the English or the Italian primate, may be questioned; but beyond doubt they were both good-natured men, and thought the English a very extraordinary people.

and acceptable as the offering up of the Church, in the unbroken order of her many members in One Body. It remains to be shewn, however, that the French or Italian ceremonial is, in any sense, higher or nobler than the English. The Corporal theory from which it sprung is a low and unreal one; and whatever tends to materialize the Presence, to substitute adoration for communion, or to confound the commemorative sacrifice with the Real, is a return to the Corporal error, and only clouds the brightness of a sacramental service. If the highest ritual be the most truthful expression of the highest truth, the Anglican Liturgy would be lowered, not raised, by such uncongenial interpolations¹.

The solemn Remembrance before God of the One Eternal Sacrifice; the Real Spiritual Presence of the great Bishop of souls, feeding His Church with the Bread of life which cometh down from heaven; the Blessed Communion, lifting these soiled and yearning hearts to the glorified Humanity on high; the dedication of body, soul, and spirit as a living sacrifice, incorporate in His, and by Him presented in Himself to His Father and our Father;—*these* are the truths of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They find their best expression in full and frequent celebrations, in the united voice of intelligent prayer and song, in the priestly blessing, and the Eucharistic eating and drinking of all present. These have a fragrance and majesty far

¹ I must be allowed to declare my own opinion that these new services are every way *lower*, less majestic, and less attractive, than the spiritual and really magnificent celebrations of Dr. Hook at Leeds, with their hundreds of devout, intelligent, and truly reverent communicants.

above perfumes and vestments. They constitute a ceremonial which is at once national, scriptural, impressive. Instead of lingering in the Levitical courts, vainly grasping at shadows that have passed away, they lead the Christian forward, clergy and people together, to the very Presence above the Cherubim. They enable us all, as priests and kings unto God, to eat of the most Holy in the Holy Place; for the Memorial, which we there eat and drink for the Remembrance of Christ, is to us the very Sacrifice—His Body broken, and His Blood shed, unto remission of sins, and immortal life.

DEO SOLI GLORIA.

APPENDIX No. I.

COUNCILS.

(FROM the Collection of Dr. H. T. Bruns, published at Berlin, 1839, in connection with Neander's *Bibliotheca*. This collection condenses the researches of Mansi, Hardouin, Labbæus and Cossartius, Justelli, Beveridge, &c.)

APOSTOLIC CANONS^a.

CAN. III.

Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν, τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ, προσενέγκῃ ἕτερά τινα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἢ μέλι ἢ γάλα ἢ ἀντὶ οἴνου σίκερα ἢ ἐπιτηδευτὰ ἢ ὄρνεις ἢ ζῶα τινα ἢ ὄσπρια, ὡς παρὰ τὴν διάταξιν Κυρίου ποιῶν, καθαρίσθω, [πλὴν νέων χιδρῶν (ἢ σταφυλῆς), τῷ καιρῷ δέοντι. Μὴ ἐξὸν δὲ ἔστω προσάγεσθαι τι ἕτερον εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἢ ἔλαιον εἰς τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ θυμίαμα τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἁγίας προσφορᾶς (τῆς θείας ἀναφορᾶς).]

The latter part of this Canon is arranged in the Latin text into a separate Canon, numbered 4: "Offerri non licet aliquid ad altare præter novas spicas et uvas, et oleum ad luminaria, et thyiamama id est incensum, tempore quo sancta celebratur oblatio." The original Canon, therefore, was an absolute prohibition, which must be later than the time of Irenæus, when the *primitiæ* were still offered (p. 320).

^a The Apostolic Canons are generally ascribed to Councils in the second and third centuries (Bev. De Marc., &c.), though Von Drey is of opinion that only nineteen (found in the 6th and 8th Books of the Apostolical Constitutions) are really Ante-Nicene. The Greek text of Joannes Scholasticus (*circ.* 550), and the Latin translation by the Roman Abbot Dionysius the Less (*circ.* 500), both attribute the collection to S. Clement of Rome. Both were first edited in the beginning of the sixteenth century.

The exceptions, added at different, perhaps distant, dates, mark the growth of ritual development. Incense is not mentioned in the Clementine Liturgy, and it is only in the latest (Chrysostom) that it is found in the *anaphora*.

CAN. VIII. (Lat., 9.)

Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἢ ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ προσφορὰς γενομένης μὴ μεταλάβοι, τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπάτω· καὶ ἐὰν εὐλογος ᾖ, συγγνώμης τυγχανέτω· εἰ δὲ μὴ λέγει, ἀφορίζεσθω, ὡς αἴτιος βλάβης γεόμενος τῷ λαῷ καὶ ὑπόνοιαν ποιήσας κατὰ τοῦ προσενέγκαντος. Some MSS. add, ὡς μὴ ὑγιῶς ἀνεγκόντος, as in the Latin, "quod recte non obtulerit."

The antiquity of this Canon is shewn by the mention of the three orders only, as distinct from the rest of the hierarchical catalogue.

CAN. IX. (Lat., 10.)

Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας πιστοὺς καὶ τῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραμένοντας δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ μετελήψει, ὡς ἀταξίαν ἐμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή.

This Canon is connected with the previous one, and both are very ancient, dating from the times of persecution, when lapses were to be suspected. Compare the second Canon of Antioch, from which Drey supposes it to be copied. Hefele thinks the reverse more probable. In either case, it is obvious that the communion of all present was indispensable; the *ἀταξία* lay in not receiving the sacrament.

SYNOD OF ANCYRA (A.D. 314).

CAN. I.

Πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐπιθύσαντας, εἴτα ἐπαναπαλαίσαντας μήτε ἐκ μεθόδου τινὸς ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀληθείας, μήτε προκατασκευάσαντας καὶ ἐπιτηδεύσαντας, καὶ πείσαντας ἵνα δόξωσι μὲν βασάνοις ὑποβάλλεσθαι, ταύτας δὲ τῷ δοκεῖν καὶ τῷ σχήματι προσαχθῆναι· τούτους

ἔδοξε τῆς μὲν τιμῆς τῆς κατὰ τὴν καθέδραν μετέχειν, προσφέρειν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἢ ὁμιλεῖν ἢ ὅλως λειτουργεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν μὴ ἐξεῖναι.

CAN. II.

Διακόνους ὁμοίως θύσαντας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπαλαίσαντας τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχειν, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν ἢ κηρύσσειν. εἰ μέντοι τινὲς τῶν ἐπισκόπων τούτοις συνίδοιεν κάματόν τινα ἢ ταπεινῶσιν πραότητος καὶ ἐθέλοιν πλεῖον τι διδόναι ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν, ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

CAN. IV.

Περὶ τῶν πρὸς βίαν θυσάντων, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις καὶ τῶν δειπνησάντων εἰς τὰ εἰδῶλα, ὅσοι μὲν ἀπαγόμενοι καὶ σχήματι φαιδρτέρῳ ἀνῆλθον καὶ ἐσθῆτι ἐχρήσαντο πολυτελεστέρα καὶ μετέσχον τοῦ παρασκευασθέντος δείπνου ἀδιαφόρως, ἔδοξεν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀκροᾶσθαι, ὑποπεσεῖν δὲ τρία ἔτη, εὐχῆς δὲ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι ἔτη δύο, καὶ τότε ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον.

SYNOD OF ANTIOCH (A.D. 341).

CAN. II.

Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκουόντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφρομένους τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατὰ τινα ἀταξίαν, τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὥς ἂν ἐξομολογησάμενοι καὶ δείξαντες καρποὺς μετανοίας καὶ παρακαλέσαντες τυχεῖν δυνηθῶσι συγγνώμης.

The Canon proceeds to prohibit private communion with the excommunicate, praying in the house with any who are not fellow-worshippers in church, and also other churches from receiving such as are excluded from their own. Any bishop, priest, deacon, or other of the canon, communicating with the excommunicate to be himself excommunicated.

This Canon comprises the 8th, 9th, and 10th Apostolical Canons. The prohibition is twofold: 1. against leaving before the prayer of the faithful, and 2. against omitting to receive the Eucharist when remaining: the abstaining is itself the *ataxia*. It is implied that the sacrament would be offered, and the head turned away to avoid it.

GENERAL COUNCIL OF NICÆA (A.D. 325).

ACTA CONC. NICÆN. GEN.

From Gelasii Hist. Conc. Nicæni, apud Labbe and Cossart, ed. 1671, vol. ii. fol. 233.

Ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης πάλιν κἀνταῦθα μὴ τῷ προκειμένῳ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ταπεινῶς προσέχωμεν, ἀλλ' ὑψώσαντες ἡμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, πίστει νοήσωμεν κείσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τραπέζης τὸν ἄμυνον τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν αἵροντα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀθύτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων θυόμενον, καὶ τὸ τίμιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἀληθῶς λαμβανόντας ἡμᾶς, πιστεύειν ταῦτα εἶναι τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀναστασεώς σύμβολα.

CAN. XI.

Περὶ τῶν παραβάτων χωρὶς ἀνάγκης ἢ χωρὶς ἀφαιρέσεως ὑπαρχόντων ἢ χωρὶς κινδύνου ἢ τινος τοιούτου, ὃ γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος Δικινίου· ἔδοξε τῇ συνόδῳ, κἀν ἀνάξιοι ἦσαν φιλανθρωπίας, ὁμως χρηστεύσασθαι εἰς αὐτούς. ὅσοι οὖν γησίως μεταμέλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκροωμένοις ποιήσουσιν οἱ (ὥς) πιστοὶ καὶ ἐπτά ἔτη ὑποπεισούνται· δύο δὲ ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν.

This Canon applies only to the least excusable of the *lapsi*, those who being previously *fideles* (communicants) had fallen without actual danger to life or property. Catechumens were only put back among the hearers for three years (Can. xiv.).

CAN. XIII.

Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐξοδεούντων ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος φυλαχθήσεται καὶ νῦν, ὥστε, εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι, τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι· εἰ δὲ ἀπογνωσθεῖς καὶ κοινωνίας πάλιν τυχὼν, πάλιν ἐν τοῖς ξῶσιν ἐξετασθῇ, μετὰ τῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς εὐχῆς μόνης ἔστω· καθόλου δὲ καὶ περὶ παντὸς οὐτινοσοῦν ἐξοδεύοντος, αἰτούντος τοῦ μετασχεῖν Εὐχαριστίας, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ δοκιμασίας ἐπιδότω.

Comp. Ancyran Can. vi. After providing for the case of a person dying under penance (who in case of recovery was to complete his term in the highest class), the Canon is extended to all persons whatsoever desiring the Eucharist at the point of death, subject to the bishop's approval.

SYNOD OF LAODICÆA (A.D. 320 or 372).

CAN. XIX.

Περὶ τοῦ δεῖν ἰδίᾳ (λειτουργίᾳ) πρῶτον μετὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχὴν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς κατηχουμένους, τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὴν εὐχὴν γίνεσθαι, καὶ τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα καὶ ὑποχωρησάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς· μίαν μὲν τὴν πρῶτην διὰ σιωπῆς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην διὰ προσφωνήσεως πληροῦσθαι, εἴθ' οὕτως τὴν εἰρήνην δίδοσθαι· καὶ μετὰ τὸ πρεσβυτέρους δοῦναι τῇ ἐπισκόπῳ τὴν εἰρήνην, τότε τοὺς λαϊκοὺς τὴν εἰρήνην διδόναι, καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ μόνοις ἐξὸν εἶναι τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ κοινωνεῖν.

CAN. LVIII.

Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις προσφορὰς (προσφορὰν) γίνεσθαι παρὰ ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων.

CONC. CART. III. (A.D. 397).

CAN. XXIV.

“ Ut in sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil amplius offeratur, quam ipse Dominus tradidit, hoc est panis et vinum aquæ mixtum [nec amplius in sacrificiis offeratur quam de uvis et frumentis].” Some old copies read [“ Primitiæ vero, seu mel et lac, quod uno die solemnissimo pro infantis mysterio solet offerri, quamvis in altari offeratur, suam tamen habent propriam benedictionem, ut a sacramento dominici corporis aut sanguinis distinguantur: nec amplius de primitiis offeratur, quam de uvis et frumentis.”]

CONC. BRACARENSE TERTIUM (A.D. 675).

CAN. I.

“ Ait enim evangelica veritas: *accepit Jesus panem et calicem et benedicens dedit discipulis suis.* Cesset ergo lac in sacrificando offerri, quia manifestum et evidens exemplum evangelicæ veritatis illuxit, quod præter panem et vinum aliud offerre non sinit. Illud vero quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis Corpus suum et Sanguinem commendavit; seorsum enim panis et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum præbuisse non legimus, excepto illi tantum discipulo quem intincta buccella magistri proditorem ostenderet, non quæ sacramenti hujus institutionem signaret.”

SYNOD OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN TRULLO

(Quinisext), A.D. 692 al. 683.

CAN. XXVIII.

Ἐπειδὴ ἐν διαφόροις ἐκκλησίαις μεμαθήκαμεν σταφυλῆς ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσφερομένης κατὰ τι κρατῆσαν ἔθος τοὺς λειτουργοὺς

ταύτην τῇ ἀναιμάκτῃ τῆς προσφορᾶς θυσίᾳ συνάπτοντας, οὕτως ἅμα τῷ λαῷ διανέμειν ἀμφότερα· συνείδομεν, ὡς μηκέτι τοῦτό τινα τῶν ιερωμένων ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' εἰς ξωποίησιν καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ τῆς προσφορᾶς μόνης μεταδιδόναι· ὡς ἀπαρχὴν δὲ τὴν τῆς σταφυλῆς λογιζομένους προσένεξιν ἰδικῶς τοὺς ἱερεῖς εὐλογοῦντας τοῖς αἰτοῦσι ταύτης μεταδιδόναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ δοτῆρος τῶν καρπῶν εὐχαριστίαν, δι' ὧν τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ὅρον αὖξει τε καὶ τρέφεται· εἴ τις οὖν κληρικὸς παρὰ τὰ τεταγμένα ποιήσῃ καθαιρείσθω.

The grapes referred to in this Canon were offered with ears of new corn at the proper season, as the first-fruits of the harvest. That they should have been consecrated and administered along with the sacrament is evidence enough against transubstantiation. The Canon allows a separate blessing and *administration* of them as a kind of lower sacrament of nature. Comp. Carth. III., Can. xxiv.

CAN. XXXII.

... 'Εἰ τις οὖν ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ κατὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τάξιν ποιεῖ καὶ ὕδωρ οἶνω μίγνυς οὕτω τὴν ἄχραντον προσάγει θυσίαν, καθαιρείσθω, ὡς ἀτελῶς τὸ μυστήριον ἐξαγγέλλων καὶ καινίζων τὰ παραδεδομένα.

“If any bishop or presbyter do not celebrate according to the ordinance delivered by the apostles, and having mixed water with wine so present the undefiled sacrifice, let him be deposed, as imperfectly shewing the mystery, and innovating on the traditions.”

This Canon has a long preamble, setting forth that in the Armenian region priests about to consecrate the unbloody sacrifice offer wine alone on the holy table, without mixing water with it, relying on a remark of John Chrysostom, who interpreting the Gospel of S. Matthew (In Matt. xxvi. Hom. 82), demands “why Jesus drank not water but wine, but to extirpate the evil heresy of those who use water

in the mysteries, whereas our Lord used wine, as He says, 'the fruit of the vine,' for the vine produces wine, not water." The Council replies that this was said of the heresy of the *Hydroparastates*, who used water *instead* of wine, and that Chrysostom in his own Church directed water to be mixed with the wine when the unbloody sacrifice was consecrated, symbolizing the mixture of blood and water that flowed from the precious side of the God Christ, our Redeemer and Saviour, for the life of the world and the ransom of sinners. Reference is also made to the Liturgies of James, the Lord's brother and first bishop of Jerusalem, and of Basil, the Archbishop of Cæsarea, prescribing wine and water for the cup; also to the Council of Carthage (III., Can. xxiv.), stating that the Lord Himself instituted the sacrament in bread and wine mixed with water. The omission of the water is thus condemned on three grounds: as a breach of apostolic ordinance, as imperfectly representing the mystery, and as innovating on the traditions of the Church.

APPENDIX No. II.

LITURGIES.

[From Dr. J. M. Neale's "Primitive Liturgies," Second Edition, London, 1868.]

THE CLEMENTINE.

Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεέ παντοκράτορ οὐχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα, καὶ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ πληροῦμεν. ἐν ᾗ γὰρ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο, λαβὼν ἄρτον ταῖς ἀγίαις καὶ ἀμώμοις αὐτοῦ χερσί, καὶ ἀναβλέψας πρὸς σέ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ πατέρα, καὶ κλάσας, ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, εἰπὼν· τοῦτο τὸ μυστήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης· λάβετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν θρυπτόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κέρασας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ ἀγιάσας, ἐπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων· πίνετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμα μου, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὅσάκις γὰρ ἔαν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ πίνητε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμὸν καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθω.

Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου, καὶ τῆς μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως, κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομέν σοι τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, εὐχαριστοῦντίς σοι δι' αὐτοῦ, ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου, καὶ ἱερατεῖναι σοι· καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα θῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνεσθής Θεός, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιον σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ἵνα οἱ μεταλα-

βόντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσεβείαν, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχῃσι, τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ ῥυσθῶσι, Πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν, ἄξιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου γίνωνται, ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχῃσι, σοῦ καταλλαγέντος ^b αὐτοῖς, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ.

LITURGY OF S. JAMES.

Μέλλων δὲ τὸν ἐκούσιον καὶ ζωopoῖον διὰ σταυροῦ θάνατον ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καταδέχεσθαι, ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾧ παρεδίδοτο, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας. [Εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς τῇ χειρὶ τὸν ἄρτον κατασχὼν λέγει.] λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ἀμώμων καὶ ἀθανάτων αὐτοῦ χειρῶν, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, ἀγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπὼν [Λέγουσιν οἱ διάκονοι, Εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Εἶτα ἐκφωνεῖ] Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον καὶ διδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ λαός.] Ἀμήν. [Εἶτα λαμβάνει τὸ ποτήριον καὶ λέγει.] Ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, ἀγιάσας, εὐλογήσας, πλήσας Πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς εἰπὼν, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχέμενον, καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς

^b Dr. Neale remarks on this expression as unscriptural, (Translation, p. 83,) and it is true that the Apostle speaks of God reconciling the world to Himself (2 Cor. v. 19) rather than of His being reconciled. But a comparison of the kindred word in S. Matt. v. 24, shews that the "reconciliation" of Holy Scripture means conciliating or *appeasing another*, quite as much as laying aside one's own enmity. In the case put by our Lord, it is the offended brother whose favour must be propitiated by the person to be reconciled unto him. In like manner, the reconciliation of the world to God is based on the removal of His displeasure by the sacrifice of Christ, "not imputing their trespasses unto them." Comp. Rom. v. 10, 11, where *καταλλαγήν* is rendered "atonement."

ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ λαός.] Ἀμήν. [Ὁ ἱερεύς.] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ὅσakis γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καταγγέλλετε, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ ὁμολογεῖτε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔχθῃ. [Λέγουσιν οἱ διάκονοι· Πιστεύομεν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν Ὁ λαός. Τὸν θάνατόν σου, Κύριε, καταγγέλλομεν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασίν σου ὁμολογοῦμεν. Ὁ ἱερεύς.] Μемνημένοι οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ τῆς τριημέρου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανούς ἀνόδου, καὶ τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας, καὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, ὅταν ἔλθῃ μετὰ δόξης κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ὅταν μέλλῃ ἀποδιδόναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφερόμεν σοι, Δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, δεόμενοι ἵνα μὴ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ποιήσῃς μεθ' ἡμῶν, μηδὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν ἀνταποδώσῃς ἡμῖν· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐπιείκειαν καὶ ἄφρατόν σου φιλανθρωπίαν, ὑπερβάς καὶ ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τῶν σῶν ἱκετῶν, χαρίσῃς ἡμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ αἰώνιά σου δωρήματα, ἃ ὀφθυλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἠτοίμασας, ὁ Θεός, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσί σε· καὶ μὴ δι' ἐμέ, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐμὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀθετήσῃς τὸν λαόν, φιλάνθρωπε Κύριε. [Ἐλτα λέγει ἐκ τρίτου·] Ὁ γὰρ λαός σου καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία σου ἱκετεύουσί σέ. [Ὁ λαός, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Πάλιν λέγει ὁ ἱερεύς.] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Ἐλέησου ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου, καὶ ἐξαπόστειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον. [Ἐλτα κλίνας τὸν αὐχένα λέγει.] τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ σύνθρονον σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ σου Υἱῷ, τὸ συμβασιλεύον· τὸ ὁμοούσιόν τε καὶ συναῖδιον· τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν νόμῳ καὶ προφῆταις καὶ τῇ καινῇ σου διαθήκῃ· τὸ καταβὰν ἐν εἰδει περιστερᾶς ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, καὶ μέιναν ἐπ' αὐτόν· τὸ καταβὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους σου ἐν εἰδει πυρίνων γλωσσῶν ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου Σιών, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς· αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα σου τὸ πανάγιον κατὰπεμψον, Δέσ-

ποτα, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα. [Καὶ ἀνιστάμενος ἐκφωνεῖ·] ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῇσαν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἀγίαση καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἁγιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. [Ὁ λαός·] Ἀμήν. [Ὁ ἱερεὺς·] καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τίμιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου [Ὁ λαός·] Ἀμήν. [Ὁ ἱερεὺς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἱστάμενος·] ἵνα γένηται πᾶσι τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, εἰς ἁγιασμόν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, εἰς καρποφορίαν ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, εἰς στηριγμὸν τῆς ἁγίας σου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἣν ἐθεμελίωσας ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τῆς πίστεως, ἵνα πύλαι ἔξου μὴ κατισχύσωσιν αὐτῆς, ῥυόμενος αὐτὴν ἀπὸ πάσης αἱρέσεως καὶ σκανδάλων, καὶ ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομιάν, διαφυλάττων αὐτὴν μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

LITURGY OF S. BASIL.

Μέλλων γὰρ ἐξίεῖναι ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκούσιον καὶ ἀοίδιμον καὶ ζωοποιὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον, τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδου ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντων χειρῶν, ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, [ὁ ἱερεὺς αἴρων τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ δεικνύει τὸν ἁγιον δίσκον λέγων ἐκφώνως] ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπὼν Δάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτο μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [ὁ χορὸς ψάλλει·] Ἀμήν [Τότε ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ ὁ διάκονος, τὰ αὐτὰ πράττουσιν, ὡς ἐν τῇ τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς·] Ὅμοιος καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου λαβὼν, κεράσας, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, [Καὶ αἴρων τῇ δεξιᾷ δεικνύει ὁμοίως μετ' εὐλαβείας τὸ ἁγιον ποτήριον, λέγων ἐκφώνως,] ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπὼν Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ χορὸς ψάλλει·] Ἀμήν Ὁ ἱερεὺς κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπεύχεται μυστικῶς·] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν ὅσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε, τὸν ἐμὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλετε, καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁμολογεῖτε. Μεμνημένοι οὖν, Δέσποτα, καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν σωτηρίων αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ

ζωοποιού Σταυροῦ, τῆς τριημέρου ταφῆς, τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, τῆς εἰς οὐρανούς ἀνόδου, τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας καὶ τῆς ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς δευτέρας αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, [Ἐκφάνως ὁ ἱερεὺς], τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα. [Ὁ χορὸς ψάλλει τὸ, Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν, σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, Κύριε, καὶ δεόμεθά σου, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. Ὁ ἱερεὺς κλίνει τὴν κεφαλὴν εὐχεται μυστικῶς.] Διὰ τοῦτο, Δέσποτα πανάγιε, καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἀνάξιοι δοῦλοί σου, οἱ καταξιωθέντες λειτουργεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐ διὰ τας δικαιοσύνας ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐποιήσαμεν τι ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἐλή σου, καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμούς σου, οὓς ἐξέχεας πλουσίως ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, θαρρύνοντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ προσθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σὲ παρακαλοῦμεν, Ἄγιε Ἀγίων, εὐδοκία τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος, ἐλθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ εὐλογήσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἀγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδείξαι, [Ὁ διάκονος ὑποτίθησι τὸ ριπίδιον, ὅπερ ἐκράτει, ἢ κάλυμμα, καὶ ἔρχεται ἐγγύτερον τῷ ἱερεῖ· καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν ἀμφότεροι τρις ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, καὶ εὐχόμενοι καθ' ἑαυτοὺς τὸ, Ὁ Θεὸς ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. Λέγοντι δὲ αὐτὸ μυστικῶς τρις.] Εἰτα, Κύριε ὁ τὸ πανάγιον σου Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ὥρᾳ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις σου καταπέμψας, τοῦτο, ἀγαθέ, μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀφ' ἡμῶν. Στίχ. Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Θεός, καὶ Πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου. Δόξα. Εὐλογητὸς εἰ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. Καὶ νῦν. Ὅτε καταβὰς τὰς γλώσσας συνέχεε. Εἰτα τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑποκλίνει ὁ διάκονος δείκνυσιν τῷ ὡραρίῳ τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον, καὶ λέγει μυστικῶς Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀνιστάμενος σφραγίζει τὰ ἅγια δῶρα, λέγων μυστικῶς.] Τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Ὁ διάκονος.] Ἀμήν. [Καὶ αὖθις ὁ αὐτὸς. Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς εὐλογῶν λέγει.] Τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο, αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Ὁ διάκονος, Ἀμήν. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς,] Τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. [Ὁ διάκονος· Ἀμήν. Καὶ αὖθις ὁ αὐτὸς δεικνύων μετὰ τοῦ ὡραρίου τὰ ἅγια ἄμφω, λέγει. Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὰ ἄμφω. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς εὐλογῶν μετὰ τῆς χειρὸς ἄμφω τὰ ἅγια λέγει.] Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ. [Ὁ διάκονος, Ἀμήν, Ἀμήν,

Ἀμήν. Καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁ διάκονος ὑποκλίνας τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ εἰπὼν τὸ, Μνησθητί μου ἅγιε Δέσποτα τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, μεθίσταται ἐν ᾧ πρότερον ἴστατο τόπῳ, λαβὼν καὶ τὸ βίπτιδιον αὐτοῖς, ὡς πρότερον. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ἐπεύχεται,] Ἡμᾶς δὲ πάντας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ Ποτηρίου μετέχοντας, ἐνώσῃς ἀλλήλοις εἰς ἐνὸς Πνεύματος ἁγίου κοινωνίαν, καὶ μηδένα ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα, ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα ποιήσῃς μετασχέιν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

LITURGY OF S. CHRYSOSTOM.

Τῇ νυκτὶ ἡ παρεδίδото, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸν παρεδίδου, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντοις καὶ ἀμώμητοις χερσίν, εὐχαριστήσας, καὶ εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις εἰπὼν· [Ἐκφώνως.] Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτο μου ἐστὶ τὸ Σῶμα, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον, εἰς ἅφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ χορός. Ἀμήν. Τούτου δὲ λεγομένου δεικνύει τῷ ἱερεῖ ὁ διάκονος τὸν ἅγιον δίσκον, κρατῶν καὶ τὸ ὠράριον τοῖς τριῶν δακτύλοις τῆς δεξιᾶς· ὁμοίως καὶ ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, συνδεικνύει καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον. Εἶτα μυστικῶς ὁ ἱερεὺς.] Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων· [Ἐκφώνως.] Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ Αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, εἰς ἅφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ χορός. Ἀμήν· Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπεύχεται.] Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τῆς σωτηρίου ταύτης ἐντολῆς, καὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγεννημένων, τοῦ σταυροῦ, τοῦ τάφου, τῆς τριημέρου ἀναστάσεως, τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβάσεως, τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν καθέδρας, τῆς δευτέρας καὶ ἐνδόξου πάλιν παρουσίας, [Ἐκφώνως.] Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοι προσφέρωμεν, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα. [Ὁ χορός. Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν, σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, Κύριε, καὶ δεόμεθά σου ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπεύχεται.] Ἔτι προσφερόμεν σοὶ τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναιμάκτον λατρείαν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, καὶ δεόμεθα, καὶ ἱκετεύομεν· κατὰπεμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα· [Καὶ ὁ μὲν διάκονος ἀποτίθῃσι τὸ βίπτιδιον καὶ ἔρχεται ἐγγύτερον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν ἀμφότεροι τρις ἐμπροσθεν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, εὐχόμενοι καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ λέγοντες τό, Ὁ Θεὸς ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. Εἶτα τό, Κύριε, ὁ τὸ πανάγιόν σου Πνεῦμα. Στίχ.

Καρδίαν καθαρὰν κτίσον ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Θεός. **Στ.** Μὴ ἀπορρίψῃς με ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου. **Εἴτα, Δόξα.** Εὐλογητὸς εἰ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ πανσόφους τοὺς Ἄλιεὺς ἀναδείξας, καταπέμψας αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην σαγηνένας φιλάνθρωπε δόξα σοι. Καὶ νῦν. Ὅτε καταβὰς τὰς γλώσσας συνέχεε, διέμεριξεν ἔθνη ὁ Ὑψίστος· ὅτε τοῦ πυρὸς τὰς γλώσσας δίδειμεν, εἰς ἐνότητα πάντας ἐκάλεσε· καὶ συμφώνως δοξάζομεν τὸ πανάγιον Πνεῦμα. **Εἴτα** τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑποκλίνας ὁ διάκονος καὶ δεικνύων σὺν τῷ ὡραρίῳ τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον λέγει μυστικῶς, Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα, τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀνιστάμενος σφαγίζει τρεῖς τὰ ἅγια δῶρα λέγων·] Καὶ ποιήσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. [Ὁ διάκονος· Ἀμήν. Καὶ αὖθις ὁ αὐτὸς, Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον. Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς εὐλογῶν λέγει·] τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦτ' ἐπίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. [Ὁ διάκονος, Ἀμήν. Καὶ αὖθις ὁ διάκονος δεικνύων μετὰ τοῦ ὡραρίου ἀμφότερα τὰ ἅγια λέγει. Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς εὐλογῶν ἀμφότερα τὰ ἅγια λέγει.] Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἀγίῳ. [Ὁ διάκονος, Ἀμήν, Ἀμήν. Ἀμήν. Καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑποκλίνας ὁ διάκονος τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ εἰπὼν τὸ Μνησθητὶ μου ἅγιε δέσποτα τοῦ ἁμαρτώλου, Ἰσταταὶ ἐν ᾧ πρότερον τόπῳ, καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ῥίπίδιον, ῥιπίζει τὰ ἅγια, ὡς καὶ τὸ πρότερον. Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ἐπεύχεται.] Ὡστε γένεσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος, εἰς βασιλείας οὐρανῶν πληρῶμα, εἰς παῤῥησίαν τὴν πρὸς σέ, μὴ κρίμα, ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα. Ἔτι προσφερόμεν σοὶ τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρείαν· [κ.τ.λ.]

LITURGY OF S. MARK.

Ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ παμβασιλεὺς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδου ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑψίστατον. . . . θάνατον σαρκί, συνανακλιθεὶς μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων, λαβὼν ἄρτον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ἀμώμων αὐτοῦ χειρῶν, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν ἴδιον Πατέρα, Θεὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ὄλων, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλόγησας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, διέδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ μακαρίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπὼν. [Ἐκφώνως.] Λάβετε, φάγετε. [Ὁ διάκονος, Ἐκτείνετε. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως.] Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλῶμενον καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν

άμαστιῶν. [Ὁ λαός.] Ἀμήν. [Ὁ ἱερεὺς λέγει ἐπευχόμενος.] ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λαβὼν, καὶ κερίαςας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πρὸς σε τὸν ἴδιον Πατέρα, Θεὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ὄλων, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, πλήσας Πνεύματος ἁγίου, μετέδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ μακαρίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπὼν [Ἐκφώνως.] Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. [Ὁ διάκονος. Ἔτι ἐκτείνετε. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως.] Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. [Ὁ λαός. Ἀμήν. Ὁ ἱερεὺς εὐχεται οὕτως.] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Ὅσακις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, πίνητε δὲ καὶ ποτήριον τοῦτο, τὸν ἐμὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλετε, καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ ἀνάληψιν ὁμολογεῖτε, ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθω. Τὸν θάνατον, Δέσποτα Κύριε παντοκράτορ, ἐπουράνιε βασιλεῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Υἱοῦ, Κυρίου δὲ καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καταγγέλλοντες, καὶ τὴν τριήμερον καὶ μακαρίαν αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὁμολογοῦντες, καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανούς ἀνάληψιν ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδραν, καὶ τὴν δευτέραν καὶ φρικτὴν καὶ φοβερὰν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, ἐν ᾗ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, σοί, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων προεθήκαμεν ἐνώπιόν σου.

Καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ παρακάλουμέν σε, φιλόανθρωπε ἀγαθέ, ἐξαπόστειλον ἐξ ὕψους τοῦ ἁγίου σου, ἐξ ἐτοιμοῦ κατοικητηρίου σου, ἐκ τῶν ἀπεριγράπτων κολπῶν, αὐτὸν τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ ἅγιον, τὸν Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐν νόμῳ καὶ προφῆταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις λαλήσαν, τὸ πανταχοῦ παρὸν καὶ τὰ πάντα πληροῦν, ἐνεργοῦν τε αὐτεξουσίως, οὐ διακονικῶς, ἐφ' οὗς βούλεται, τὸν ἁγιασμόν εὐδοκία τη σῇ, τὸ ἀπλοῦν τὴν φύσιν, τὸ πλημερές τὴν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν τῶν θείων χαρισμάτων πηγὴν· τό σοι ὁμοούσιον· τὸ ἐκ σοῦ ἐκπορεύομενον· τὸ σύνθρονον τῆς βασιλείας σου, καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Υἱοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Ἔτι δὲ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τούτους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ποτήρια ταῦτα τὸ Πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον [κατάμεψον,] ἵνα αὐτὰ ἁγιασῇ καὶ

τελειώσει, ὡς παντόδυναμος Θεός, [Ἐκφώνως] καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα, [Ὁ λαός, Ἀμήν. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως.] Τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος, καὶ παμβασιλέως ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. [Ὁ διάκονος. Κατέλθετε οἱ διάκονοι. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως.] Ἵνα γένωνται πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν, εἰς πίστιν, εἰς νῆψιν, εἰς ἴασιν, εἰς σωφροσύνην, εἰς ἀγιασμόν, εἰς ἐπανεώσιν ψυχῆς, σώματος, καὶ πνεύματος, εἰς κοινωνίαν μακαριότητος ζωῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ἀφθαρσίας, εἰς δοξολογίαν τοῦ παναγίου σου ὀνόματος, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἵνα σου καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντί, δοξάσθῃ καὶ ὑμνήθῃ καὶ ἀγιάσθῃ τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ἔντιμον καὶ δεδοξασμένον σου ὄνομα σὺν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. [Ὁ λαός. Ὡςπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστίν.]

APPENDIX No. III.

FATHERS.

CLEMENS ROMANUS, (A.D. 68, *al.* 97.) Ep. i. *ad Corinth.*

Chap. xli. Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν, ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους. τὰς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἰκῇ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὥρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις. ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάσῃ αὐτοῦ βουλήσῃ, ἵν' ὁσιῶς πάντα τὰ γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ εὐπρόσδεκτα εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι· τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. Τῷ γὰρ ἁρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσιν, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λεῦγται ἰδίαι διακόνια ἐπικείμεναι· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασι δέδεται.

Cap. xlii. Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστεῖτω Θεῷ· ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὥρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. οὐ παναχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ, ἢ εὐχῶν, ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ πλημμελίας, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κακεῖ δε οὐκ ἐν πάντι τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἁρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν. οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθήκον τῆς βουλῆσεως αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντές τι, θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν·

Cap. xlii. Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . , κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθέστησαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ Πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεῦειν (xliii.) Ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἂν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσιῶς προσεεῖγοντας τὰ δῶρα, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν.

IGNATIUS (A.D. 101.)

Ad Ephes. Μηδεις πλανάσθω· ἐὰν μή τις ἢ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσίαστη-
ρίου ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ Θεοῦ, (cap. v.) ἐνα ἄρτον κλώντες,
ὅς ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, (cap. xx.)

Ad Philad. σπουδάξετε οὖν μὴ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ
σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἔνωσιν
τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσ-
βυτέρῳ καὶ διακόνοις, τοῖς συνδούλοις μου, (cap. iv.)

Ad Smyrn. εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἄπεχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ
ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν χρηστότητι ὁ Πατὴρ
ἤγειρεν· οἱ οὖν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ συζητοῦντες ἀποθνή-
σκουσιν, συνέφερον δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾶν ἵνα καὶ ἀναστῶσιν, (cap. vii.)

Ad Trall. ὁ ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὢν καθαρὸς ἐστίν· διὰ καὶ ὑπακούει
τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις· ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς ὢν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ
χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν διακόνων τι
πράσσω· ὁ τοιοῦτος μεμíanται τῇ συνειδήσει, καὶ ἐστὶν ἀπίστου
χείρων, (cap. vii.)

JUSTIN MARTYR, (A.D. 140.)

Apologia Prima (ad Antoninum Pium.)

Cap. lxn. ἀλλήλοις φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν·
ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον
ὑδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν
ὄλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀνα-
πέμπει· καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιώσασθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ
ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὐ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν,
πῶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν. τὸ δὲ Ἀμήν, τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ
φωνῇ, τὸ γένοιτο σημαίνει· εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ
εὐφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῶν διάκονοι
διδόσασιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος
ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὑδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

Cap. lxvi. καὶ ἡ τροφή αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν Εὐχαριστία, ἥς

οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδασγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσιως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν· οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς σάρκες καὶ αἷμα κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκεν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου. τοῦτέστι τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.

Cap. lxvii. . . ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Ποιητὴν τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου· καὶ τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα, πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν, ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρι ἐγχωρεῖ. εἴτα, παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, προσεστῶς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται· ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· καὶ ὡς προέφηκεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προσεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπεύφημει λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἐκμετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαρισθέντων ἐκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. Οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ βούλεται δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ τροεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ διὰ νόσον ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἀπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρεῖᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ

πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας κόσμον ἐποίησε· καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη.

Dialogus cum Tryphone.

Cap. xli. Καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ὧ ἄνδρες, (ἔλεγον) ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λίπρας προσφέρεισθαι παραδοθεῖσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρουμένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης ποιηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν, ἵνα ἅμα τε εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ Θεῷ ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ τὸν κόσμον κεκτικέναι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. . . . After citing Mal. i. 10, 11, he proceeds: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντί τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἔθνων προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι, τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ βεβηλοῦν.

Cap. lxx. After citing Isaiah xxxiii. 13—19: "Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προφητείᾳ περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν, δι' οὗ καὶ παθητὺς γέγονε· καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν, φαίνεται.

Cap. cxvi. . . . πυρωθέντες διὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμέν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτός ὁ Θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ, εἰπὼν ὅτι ἐν παντί τόπῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι θυσίας εὐαρέστους αὐτῷ καὶ καθαρὰς προσφέροντες· οὐδέχεται δὲ παρ' οὐδενὸς θυσίας ὁ Θεός, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων αὐτοῦ (cxvii.) πάντας οὖν, οἱ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου θυσίας [προσφέροντες] ὡς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν, ἐπὶ τῇ Εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, τὰς ἐν παντί τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γίνομενας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προλαβὼν ὁ Θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ, τὰς δὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ δι' ἐκείνων ὑμῶν τῶν ἱερέων γινομένης ἀπαναίνεται, λέγων, καὶ τὰς θυσίας ὑμῶν οὐ προσδέξομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν. . . . Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαρισταί, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων

γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐαρέστοι εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι· ταῦτα γὰρ μόναι καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀνάμνησει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν, ζῆρας τε καὶ ὕγρως, ἐν ἣ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεός (υἱός) τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται.

IRENÆUS, (A.D. 167.)

ADVERSUS HÆRESES, LIB. IV. CAP. XVII. (al. xxxii.)

“Ex quibus omnibus manifestum est, quia non sacrificia et holocaustomata quærebat ab eis Deus, sed fidem, et obedientiam, et justitiam, propter illorum salutem. Sicut in Osee propheta docens Deus suam voluntatem, dicebat: *Misericordiam volo quam sacrificium, et agnitionem Dei super holocaustomata.* Sed et Dominus noster eadem monebat eos, dicens, *Si enim cognovissetis, quid est, misericordiam volo quam sacrificium, nunquam condemnaretis immerentes:* testimonium quidem reddens prophetis, quoniam veritatem prædicabant: illos autem arguens sua culpa insipientes. Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec in infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura panis est accepit, et gratias egit dicens, *Hoc est corpus meum.* Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in novo testamento, de quo in duodecim prophetis Malachias sic præsignificavit: ‘*Non est mihi voluntas in vobis, dicit Dominus omnipotens, et sacrificium non accipiam de manibus vestris. Quoniam ab ortu solis usque ad occasum nomen meum glorificatur inter gentes, et in omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, et sacrificium purum. Quoniam magnum est nomen meum in gentibus, dicit Dominus omnipotens:*’ manifestissimè significans per hæc, quoniam prior quidem populus cessabit offerre Deo:

omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc purum, *nomen autem ejus glorificatur in gentibus.*"

Cap. xxxiii. "Quod est autem nomen, quod in gentibus glorificatur, quam quod est Domini, 'per quem glorificatur Pater, et glorificatur homo: et quoniam proprii filii ejus est, et ab eo factus est homo, suum illud vocat. Quemadmodum si quis rex ipse filii sui pingat imaginem, juste suam illam dicit imaginem secundum utrumque, quoniam et filii ejus est, et quoniam ipse fecit eam: sic et Jesu Christi nomen, quod per universum mundum glorificatur in ecclesia, suum esse confitetur Pater, et quoniam filii ejus est, et quoniam ipse scribens id ad salutem dedit hominum. Quoniam ergo nomen filii proprium Patris est, et Deo omnipotenti per Jesum Christum offert ecclesia, bene ait secundum utraque, *et in omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, et sacrificium purum.* Incensa autem Joannes in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait sanctorum."

Cap. xxxiv. (xviii. al.) "Igitur ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei, non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus. Per munus enim erga regem et honos et affectio ostenditur: quod in omni simplicitate et innocentia Dominus volens nos offerre, prædicavit, dicens: *Cum igitur offers munus tuum ad altare, et recordatus fueris, quoniam frater tuus habet aliquid adversum te, dimitte munus tuum ante altare, et vade primum reconciliari fratri tuo, et tunc reversus offer munus tuum.* Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ, sicut et Moses ait: *Non apparebis vacuus ante conspectum Domini Dei tui:* ut in quibus gratus extitit homo, in his gratus ei deputatus, cum est (?) ab eo percipiat honorem. Et non genus oblationum reprobaturum est; oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic: sacrificia in populo, sacrificia in

ecclesia; sed species immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis offeratur. Unus enim et idem Dominus, proprium autem character servilis oblationis, et proprium liberorum, uti et per oblationes ostendatur indicium libertatis. Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, in sententia pura, et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in dilectione ferventi, primitias earum quæ sunt ejus creaturarum offerentes: et hanc oblationem ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus. Judæi autem jam non offerunt: manus enim eorum sanguine plenæ sunt; non enim receperunt Verbum per quod offertur Deo: sed neque omnes hæreticorum synagogæ. Alii enim alterum præter fabricatorem dicentes Patrem, ideo quæ secundum nos creaturæ sunt offerentes ei, cupidum alieni ostendunt cum et aliena concupiscentem. Qui vero ex defectione et ignorantia et passione dicunt facta ea que sunt secundum nos, et ignorantia et passionis et defectionis fructus offerentes, peccant in Patrem suum, contumeliam facientes magis ei, quam gratias agentes. Quomodo autem constabit eis, eum panem in quo gratiæ actæ sint Corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem Sanguinis [Sanguinem] ejus, si non ipsum fabricatoris mundi Filium dicant, id est, Verbum ejus, per quod lignum fructificat, defluunt fontes, et terra dat primum quidem fœnum, post deinde spicam, deinde plenum triticum in spica? Quomodo autem rursus dicunt carnem in corruptionem devenire, et non percipere vitam, quæ Corpore Domini et Sanguine alitur? Ergo aut sententiam mutant, aut absterneant offerendo quæ prædicta sunt. Nostra autem consonans est sententia Eucharistiæ, et Eucharistia rursus confirmat sententiam nostram. Offerimus enim ei, quæ sunt ejus, congruenter communicationem et unitatem prædicantes carnis et spiritus. Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis,

percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans. terrena et cœlesti, sic et corpora nostra percipientia Eucharistiam jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia."

The original Greek, as here recovered from the *Parallela* of John Damascenus, runs thus:—Πῶς τὴν σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην; ἢ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα παραιτίσθωσαν· ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ Εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ Εὐχαριστία βέβαιαι τὴν γνώμην· Προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἔνωσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες, [καὶ ὁμολογοῦντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἔγερσιν^a] ὥς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος (τὴν) ἔκκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' Εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκῦια, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς Εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα^b.

"Offerimus enim ei non quasi indigenti sed gratias agentes dominationi ejus et sanctificantes creaturam. . . . Sicut igitur non his indigens attamen a nobis propter nos fieri vult, ne simus infructuosi: ita id ipsum Verbum dedit populo præceptum faciendarum oblationum, quamvis non indigeret eis, ut disceret Deo servire. Sic et ideo nos quoque offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione. Est ergo altare in cœlis. Illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes nostræ diriguntur: et ad templum, quemadmodum Johannes in Apocal. ait, *et apertum est templum Dei*, et tabernaculum. *Ecce enim inquit tabernaculum Dei in quo habitabit cum hominibus* c."

Lib. v. cap. ii. "Vani autem omnimodo qui universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt et carnis salutem negant, et

^a These words are rejected by Grabe as spurious, and there is nothing in the Latin version corresponding to them.

^b Ed. Benedict., p. 251.

^c Rev. xi. 19; xxi. 3.

regenerationem ejus spernunt, dicentes non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis. Sic autem secundum [si autem non salvetur] hæc videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiæ communicatio Sanguinis ejus, neque panis quem frangimus communicatio Corporis ejus est, Sanguis enim non est nisi a venis et carnibus, et a reliqua quæ est secundum hominem substantia, qua vere factum Verbum Dei sanguine suo redemit nos quando erga et mixtus calix et factus panis percipit Verbum Dei et fit Eucharistia Sanguinis et Corporis Christi, ex quibus augetur et consistit carnis nostræ substantia; quomodo carnem negant capacem esse donationis Dei, qui est vita æterna, quæ Sanguine et Corpore Christi nutritur, et membrum ejus (est)? . . non de spiritali aliquo et invisibili homine dicens hæc^d sed de ea dispositione quæ ex carnibus et nervis et ossibus consistit, quæ de calice qui est Sanguis ejus nutritur et de pane qui est Corpus ejus augetur.”

S. Irenæi Fragmentum Secundum. Ed. C. M. Pfaffius,
Lug. Bat. 1743.

Οἱ ταῖς δευτέραις τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεσι παρηκολυθηκότες ἴσασι, τὸν Κύριον νίαν προσφορὰν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ καθεστηκέναι κατὰ τὸ Μαλαχίου τοῦ προφήτου. Διότι ἀπὸ ἀναταλῶν ἡλίου καὶ ἕως δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου δεδοξασται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσάγεται τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ θυσία καθαρὰ, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει λέγει. τὰ θυμιάματα εἰσὶν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ ἡμᾶς παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἡμῶν. καὶ πάλιν. ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως τουτέστι καρπὸν χειλέων. Αὗται μὲν αἱ προσφοραὶ οὐ κατὰ τὸν νόμον εἰσὶ, οὐδὲ τὸ χειρόγραφον ἐξαλείψας, ὁ Κύριος ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἤρκεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, ἐν πνεύματι γὰρ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν τὸν Θεόν, διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ τῆς Εὐχαριστίας οὐκ ἔστι σαρκικὴ ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ

^d Eph. v. 30.

καὶ ἐν τούτῳ καθαρὰ. Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε ἐκφύσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφήν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελείσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφῇ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου, τύχωσιν. Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφορὰς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγοντες, οὐ τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόγμασι προσέρχονται, ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς λειτουργοῦντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθήσονται.

ATHENAGORAS, (A.D. 150).

Legatio pro Christianis.

Cap. xiii. Καὶ πρῶτόν γε περὶ τοῦ μὴ θύειν ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ Πατὴρ οὐ δεῖται αἵματος οὐδὲ κνίσσης, οὐδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θυμιαμάτων εὐωδίας, αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ τελεία εὐωδία, ἀνευδεὴς καὶ ἀπροσδεής· ἀλλὰ θυσία αὐτῷ μεγίστη, ἂν γιγνώσκωμεν τίς ἐξέτεινε καὶ συνεσφαίρωσε τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ τὴν γῆν κέντρου δίκην ἤδρασε, τίς συνήγαγε τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς θαλάσσας, καὶ διέκρινε τὸ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότους, τίς ἐκόσμησεν ἄστροις τὸν αἰθέρα, καὶ ἐποίησε πᾶν σπέρμα τὴν γῆν ἀναβάλλειν, τίς ἐποίησε ζῶα, καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἔπλασεν ὅταν ἔχοντες τὸν δημιουργὸν Θεὸν συνέχοντα καὶ ἐποπτάνοντα ἐπιστήμη καὶ τέχνη, καθ' ἣν ἄγει τὰ πάντα, ἐπαίρωμεν ὁσίους χεῖρας * αὐτῷ, ποίας ἔτι χρεῖαν ἐκατόμβης ἔχει;

Καὶ τοὺς μὲν θυσίῃσι καὶ εὐωχῶνς ἀγανῆσι,

Λοιβῇ τε κνίσσῃ τε παρατρῶπως ἄνθρωποι

Λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβαίῃ, καὶ ἀμάρτη†.

τί δέ μοι ὀλοκαυτώσεων, ὢν μὴ δεῖται ὁ Θεός; καὶ τοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν‡.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS. *Stromatum*, Lib. vii.

Cap. vi. Εἰ δέ τιμῶμεν χαίρει, φύσει ἀνευδεὲς ὑπάρχον, οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἡμεῖς δι' εὐχῆς τιμῶμεν τὸν Θεόν· καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν

* 1 Tim. ii. 8.

† Hom. Il. ix. 495.

‡ Rom. xii. 1.

ἀρίστην καὶ ἀγιωτάτην μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἀναπέμπομεν τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ Λόγῳ γεραίροντες· δι' οὗ παραλαμβάνομεν τὴν γνῶσιν διὰ τούτου δοξάζοντες δ' (ἐφ' οἷς) μεμαθήκαμεν· ἔστι γοῦν τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν θυσιαστήριον ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἐπίγειον, τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀνακειμένων, μίαν ὥσπερ ἔχον φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν καὶ μίαν γνώμην. . . . καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας λόγος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων ψυχῶν ἀναθυμώμενος, ἐκκαλυπτομένης ἅμα τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς διανοίας ἀπάσης τῷ Θεῷ. . . . βωμὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς ἄγιον τὴν δικαίαν ψυχὴν, καὶ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτῆς θυμίαμα τὴν ὁσίαν εὐχὴν λέγουσιν ἡμῖν ἀπιστήσουσιν ; . . . αἱ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν νόμον θυσίαι τὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐσέβειαν ἀλληγοροῦσι.

Cap. vii. ὅθεν οὔτε ὠρισμένον τόπον οὐδὲ ἐξαιρέτον ἱερὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἑορτὰς τινὰς καὶ ἡμέρας ἀποτεταγμένας, ἀλλὰ τὸν πάντα βίον ὁ γνωστικός ἐν πάντι τόπῳ, κἂν καθ' ἑαυτὸν μόνος ὢν τυγχάνῃ, καὶ ὅπου τινὰς ἀν τῶν ὁμοίως πεπιστευκότων ἔχῃ, τιμᾷ τὸν Θεὸν . . . πάντων δὲ τὴν σεμνὴν ἀπόλαυσιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀναγαγὼν ἀεὶ, καὶ τῆς βρώσεως καὶ τοῦ πόματος καὶ τοῦ χρίσματος, τῷ δοτῇ τῶν ὅλων ἀπάρχεται, χάριν ὁμολογῶν, καὶ διὰ τῆς δωρεᾶς καὶ τῆς χρήσεως, καὶ διὰ λόγου τοῦ δοθέντος αὐτῷ. . .

αὐτίκα θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ εὐχαὶ τε καὶ αἶνοι καὶ αἱ πρὸ τῆς ἐστίσεως ἐντεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν ψαλμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὕμνοι παρὰ τὴν ἐστίασιν πρὸ τε τῆς κοίτης· ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ εὐχαὶ πάλιν . . . τί δ' ; οὐ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην θυσίαν, τὴν κατὰ τοὺς θεομένους ἐπίδοσιν, καὶ δογμάτων καὶ χρημάτων, γιγνώσκει ;

Pædagogus. Lib. ii.

Cap. ii. διπλὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικὸν ὃ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ, πνευματικὸν τοῦτεστιν ὃ κεχρίσμεθα· καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι πλεῖν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαμβάνειν ἀφθαρσίας· ἰσχὺς δὲ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἷμα σαρκὸς. ἀναλόγως τοίνυν κρίνεται ὁ μὲν οἶνος τῷ ὕδατι τῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ πνεῦμα· καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς πίστιν (πόσιν) εὐωχεῖ τὸ κρᾶμα· τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὁδηγεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα· ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὐθις κρᾶσις, ποτοῦ δε καὶ λόγου, Εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπανουμένη καὶ καλή.

Strom. Lib. i.

Cap. xix. Καὶ τοῖς ἑνδεέσι φρενῶν παρακελεύομαι, λέγουσα, φησὶν ἡ Σοφία, τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὰς αἱρέσεις δηλονότι· ἄρτων κρυφίων ἡδέως ἄφασθε, καὶ ὕδατος κλοπῆς γλυκεροῦ, ἄρτον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἐπ' ἄλλων τινῶν ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ ὕδατι κατὰ τὴν προσφορὰν, μὴ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, χρωμένων, αἱρέσεων, ἐμφανῶς τατοῦσης τῆς Γραφῆς. εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ καὶ ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν.

Lib. iv. 25. Μετ' ἡμετέρας βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψί· στου, ὁ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἄρτον τὴν ἡγιασμένην διδοὺς τροφήν, εἰς τύπον Εὐχαριστίας.

ORIGEN, (A.D. 185—254).

Contra Celsum, Liber viii.

Cap. xiii. ἀλλὰ τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν καὶ ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα, ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἡμῶν ἰκεσίαις καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβουμεν, προσάγοντες τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὄλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ· ὃ πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἰλασμὸν ὄντα (περὶ) τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν προσαγαγεῖν ὡς ἀρχιερέα καὶ εὐχὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς ἐντεῦξεις ἡμῶν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ.

Cap. xix. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ναοὺς ναοῖς δεῖ παραβαλλεῖν . . . ἐκτρεφόμεθα δὲ τῷ πάσης ζωῆς χορηγῷ ἀψύχους καὶ νεκροὺς οἰκοδομεῖν νεώς· . . . (xxi.) . . . καὶ ἐορτάζει γὰρ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὁ τὰ δέοντα πράττων, αἰεὶ εὐχόμενος, διὰ παντὸς θύων τὰς ἀναιμάκτους ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐχαῖς θυσίας . . . (xxii.) . . . ἐὰν δὲ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρῃ τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν κυριακῶν, ἢ παρασκευῶν, ἢ τοῦ Πάσχα, ἢ τῆς πεντεκοστῆς δι' ἡμερῶν γινόμενα, λεκτέον καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ μὲν τέλειος . . . αἰεὶ ἐστί αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, καὶ αἰεὶ ἄγει κυριακάς ἡμέρας . . . (cap. xxix.) Κέλσος μὲν, ὡς ἀγνοῶν Θεόν, τὰ χαριστήρια δαίμοσι ἀποδιδύτω· ἡμεῖς δὲ, τῷ τοῦ πάντος Δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθείσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίων τι, καὶ ἀγιάζον τοὺς μεθ' ὑγιούς προθέσεως αὐτῶ χρωμένους. Ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀπαρχὰς Κέλσος μὲν δαίμονιαις ἀνατιθέναι βούλεται· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ εἰπόντι, βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ (Gen. i. 11.) ᾧ δὲ τὰς

ἀπαρχὰς ἀποδίδομεν, τούτῳ καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀναπέμπομεν, ἔχοντες ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ κρατοῦμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας ἕως ἂν ζῶμεν, φιλανθρώπου τυγχάνοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν φανερωμένου. (Cap. lvii.) ἔστι δὲ καὶ σύμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος Εὐχαριστία καλούμενος.

In Leviticum, Hom. xiii.

“Sed si referatur hæc ad mysterii magnitudinem invenies commemorationem istam habere ingentis repropitiationis effectum. Si redeas ad illum panem qui de cælo descendit et dat huic mundo vitam; illum panem propositionis quem proposuit Deus propitiationem per fidem in sanguine ejus; et si respicias ad illam commemorationem de qua dicit Dominus, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, invenies quod ista est commemoratio sola quæ propitium facit hominibus Deum. Si ergo intentius ecclesiastica mysteria recorderis in his quæ Lex scribit, futuræ veritatis invenies imaginem præformatam. Sed de his non plura disserere quod recordatione sola intelligi sufficit. . . . Thuris species formam tenet orationum . . . sed hoc est thus quod Deus ab hominibus sibi quærit offerri, ex quo capit odorem suavitatis, orationes ex corde puro et conscientia bona. Addit et *in die sabbatorum*, id est in requie animarum. . . . Aaron et filii ejus genus est electum, genus sacerdotale . . . quod sumus omnes qui credimus in Christo. Locum autem sanctum ego in terris non requiro positum sed in corde. . . . Unde simili modo etiam tibi Lex ista proponitur, ut cum acceperis panem mysticum in loco mundo manduces eum, hoc est ne in anima contaminata et peccatis polluta Dominici corporis sacramenta percipias. *Quicumque enim manducaverit, inquit, panem et biberit calicem domini indigne reus erit corporis et sanguinis domini . . . sancta enim sanctorum sunt*^h.”

^h Perhaps *sanctorum* should be rendered “of persons” rather than “things,” as in the text, p. 337.

In Lev., Hom. i.

“Nisi quia forte hoc intelligi voluit, quod sanguis Jesu non solum in Hierusalem effusus est, ubi erat altare et basis ejus et tabernaculum testimonii, sed et quod super illud altare quod est in cœlis ubi et ecclesia primitivorum est, idem ipse sanguis aspersus erit, sicut et apostolus dicit quia *pacificavit per sanguinem crucis suæ sive quæ in terra sunt, sine quæ in cœlis.* Recte ergo secundo nominat altare quod est ad ostium tabernaculæ testimonii, quia non solum pro terrestribus sed etiam pro cœlestibus oblati sunt hostia Jesus : et hic quidem pro hominibus ipsam corporalem materiam sanguinis sui fudit, in cœlestibus vero, ministrantibus (si qui illi initi sunt) sacerdotibus, vitalem corporis sui virtutem, velut spiritalem quoddam sacrificium immolavit.”

In Lev., Cap. xvi. Hom. ix.

“Oportet ergo nos quærere pontificem qui semel in anno, id est per omne hoc præsens sæculum, sacrificium obtulit Deo, indutus veste, cujus, Domine juvante, quæ sit qualitas ostendemus . . . tunica ergo sanctificata linea induitur verus pontifex Christus, cum naturam terrenam corporis sumit . . . adverte quomodo semel in anno isto in die repropitiationis intrat in sancta sanctorum, hoc est, cum impleta dispensatione penetrat cœlos et intrat ad Patrem, ut eum propitium humano generi faciet, et exoret pro omnibus credentibus in se. . . . Igitur dies propitiationis manet nobis usque quo occidat sol, id est, usque quo finem mundus accipiat. Stamus enim nos pro foribus, operientes pontificem nostrum commorantem intra sancta sanctorum, id est apud Patrem, et exorantem pro peccatis eorum qui se expectant.”

In Matt., Cap. xv.

Οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα ἀγιάζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κἀν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκραισιτέρων νομιζῆται ἀγιάζειν ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος ἄρτος τοῦ Κυρίου. . . . τὸ ἀγιαζόμενον βρῶμα, κατὰ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως ὠφελῖμον γίνεται. . . . καὶ οὐχ

ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῇ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν
τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν.

Commentariorum Series. In Matthæum, 85.

“Non enim panem illum visibilem, quem tenebat in manibus, Corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum, sed Verbum in cujus mysterio fuerat panis ille frangendus. Nec potum illum visibilem Sanguinem suum dicebat, sed Verbum in cujus mysterio potus ille fuerat effundendus. Nam Corpus Dei Verbi aut Sanguis, quid aliud esse potest nisi verbum quod nutrit et verbum quod lætificat cor.” [The Benedictine Editor remarks that these words sound *parum Catholice*. His explanation is that Origen, with other Fathers, distinguished *three* things in the Eucharist; 1. the sensible species; 2. the *substantiam intus latentem*; and 3. *mysticam quandam significationem*: but the second of these distinctions was invented long after Origen.]

In Matt., Cap. xv.

“Dixerit autem quispiam in hunc incidens locum, quod sicut quod ingreditur in os non polluit hominem, etiamsi putetur a Judæis pollutum, ita quod ingreditur in os non sanctificat hominem, etiamsi a simplicioribus credatur sanctificare, nimirum is qui vocatur panis Domini; et est ni fallor oratio non contemnenda. . . . Et quemadmodum nihil est impurum per se . . . ita quod sanctificatur per verbum Dei et per obsecrationem, non suapte natura sanctificat utentem. . . . Nec materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo, est qui prodest non indigne Domino comedenti. Et hoc quidem de typica symbolicoque corpore. Multa porro et de ipso Verbo dici possent, quod factum est Caro, verusque cibus, quem qui comederit omnino vivet in æternum, quem nullus malus potest edere. Etenim si fieri possit ut qui malus adhuc perseveret edat Verbum factum carnem, quum sit Verbum et panis vivus, nequaquam scriptum fuisset *quisquis ederit panem hunc vivet in æternum*.”

TERTULLIAN, (A.D. 200).

Adversus Marcionem, Cap. iv.

40. "Professus itaque se concupiscentia concupisse edere pascha ut suum (indignum enim ut quid alienum concupisceret Deus) acceptum panem et distributum discipulis Corpus illum suum fecit, *hoc est Corpus meum* dicendo, id est figura Corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset Corpus. . . . Quid tunc voluerit significasse panem satis declaravit, Corpus suum vocans panem. Sic et in calicis mentione, testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum, substantiam corporis confirmavit. Nullius enim corporis sanguis potest esse nisi carnis. . . . Ut autem et sanguinis venterem figuram in vino recognoscat, aderit Esaias, *quare rubra*, &c., (lxiii. 2.) Multo manifestius Genesis in benedictione Judæ, ex cujus tribu carnis census Christi processurus, jam tunc Christum in Juda deliniabat. *Lavabit*, inquit, *in vino stolam suam et sanguine uvæ amictum suum*: stolam et amictum carnem demonstrans et vinum sanguinem. Ita et nunc sanguinem suum in vino consecravit qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuravit."

De Oratione, xix.

"Memoria præceptorum viam orationis sternit ad cælum, quorum præcipuum est,—Ne prius ascendamus ad Dei altare quam si quid discordiæ vel offensæ cum fratribus contraxerimus resolvamus. Quid est enim ad pacem Dei recedere sine pace? Ad remissionem debitorum cum retentione? . . . Similiter et stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit? an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solennia erit statio tua, si ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto Corpore Domini et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii."

De Exhortatione Castitatis.

"Duplex enim rubor est quia in secundo matrimonio duæ uxores eundem circumstant maritum; una spiritu, alia in

carne: neque enim pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut jam receptæ apud Dominum, pro cujus spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis."

De Monogamia.

"Enimvero et pro anima ejus orat, et refugium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus."

CYPRIAN, (A.D. 246—258).

De Lapsis, Cap. xxvi.

"Et quidem alius, quia et ipse maculatus, sacrificio a sacerdote celebrato, partem cum cæteris ausus est latenter accipere, sanctum Domini edere et contrectare non potuit; cinerem ferre se, apertis manibus, invenit. Documento unius ostensum est Dominum recedere cum negatur, nec immerentibus ad salutem prodesse quod sumitur, quando gratia salutaris in cinerem, sanctitate fugiente, mutatur."

Epist. ad Cæcilium, (lxii. al. lxiii.)

2. "Admonitos autem nos scias, ut in calice offerendo Dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecerit, ut calix qui in commemoratione ejus offertur mixtus vino offeratur. . . .

4. "In sacerdote Melchisedec sacrificii Domini sacramentum præfiguratum est. Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scilicet Corpus et Sanguinem? . . . Ut ergo in Genesi per Melchisedec sacerdotem benedictio circa Abraham posset rite celebrari, præcedit ante imago sacrificii Christi, in pane et vino scilicet constituta; quam rem perficiens et adimplens, Dominus panem et calicem mixtum vino obtulit, et qui est plenitudo veritatis veritatem præfiguratæ imaginis adimplevit.

11. “. . . . Unde apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri si desit vinum calici, nec sacrificium dominicum legitima sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio et sacrificium nostrum respondeat Passioni.

13. “. . . . videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi; quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur Christo populus adunatur . . . sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest. Nam si vinum tantum quis offerat, Sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis; si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo.

14. “. . . . Quod si nec minima de mandatis Dominicis licet solvere, quanto magis tam magna, tam grandia, tam ad ipsum Dominicæ Passionis et nostræ redemptionis sacramentum pertinentia, fas non est infringere, aut in aliud quod divinitus institutum sit, humana traditione mutare. Nam si Jesus Christus, Dominus et Deus noster, ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcipit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur; et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.

16, 17. “Et quia Passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus (*Passio est enim Domini sacrificium quod offerimus*) nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit facere debemus (citing 1 Cor. xi. 26), quotiescunque ergo calicem in commemorationem Domini et Passionis ejus offerimus, id quod constat Dominum fecisse faciamus.”

‘EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA, (A.D. 315).

Demonstratio Evangelica, Liber i. Cap. xli.

Μετὰ δὴ πάντα, οἷον τι θαυμάσιον θῆμα καὶ σφάγιον ἐξείρετον
τῷ Πατρὶ καλλιεργσάμενος, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτη-

ρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν. τοῦτο καὶ προφητῶν ὁ θαυμάσιος Δαβὶδ θείῳ πνεύματι τὸ μέλλον προλαβὼν ἐθέσπισεν, εἰπὼν (Ps. xl. 6), ἄντικρυς ἀντὶ τῶν πάλαι θυσιῶν καὶ ὀλοκαυκωμάτων τὴν ἑνσαρκον τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν, καὶ τὸ καταρτισθῆν αὐτοῦ σῶμα, προσενηνέχθαι τῷ Θεῷ διδάξας, τοῦ τότε αὐτὸ τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ εὐαγγελίζεται, ὡσὰν μέγα μυστήριον ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου τῇ προφητικῇ φωνῇ προαναπεφωνημένον. τούτου δὴτα τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος, κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς Διαθήκης παρεληφότες πάλιν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου Δαβὶδ παιδεύομεθα λέγειν, (Ps. xxiii. 5,) διαῤῥήδην γοῦν ἐν τούτοις καὶ τὸ μυστικὸν σημαίνεται χρίσμα καὶ τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιεροῦντες τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας διὰ παντὸς βίου τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ, δεδιδάγμεθα. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ Ἡσαίας ὁ μέγας προφήτης, θαυμαστῶς τῷ θείῳ Πνεύματι προέγνω, (Isaiah xxv. 1, &c., with Ps. l. 14, 15; cxli. 2; li. 17); ταῦτα δὴ οὖν πάντα ἐξ αἰῶνας τεθεσπισμένα διὰ τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας, κατὰ τὸν παρόντα καιρὸν πρὸς ἀπάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκτελεῖται, ἀληθείας ἐπὶ μαρτυρούσης τῇ προφητικῇ φωνῇ, δι' ἧς τὰς κατὰ Μωσέα θυσίας ὁ Θεὸς παραιτησάμενος, τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ θεσπίζει, λέγων (Mal. i. 11), θύομεν δὴτα τοιγαροῦν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσσης· θύομεν τὸ ἔνθεον καὶ σέμνον καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θῦμα, θύομεν καινῶς, κατὰ τὴν καινὴν Διαθήκην, τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν· θυσία γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον εἴρηται (Ps. li. 17), καὶ δὴ καὶ θυμῶμεν τὸ προφητικὸν θυμίαμα, ἐν παντί τόπῳ προσκομίζοντες αὐτῷ τὸν εὐῶδη καρπὸν τῆς παναρέτου θεολογίας, διὰ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐχῶν ἀναφέροντες (Ps. cxli. 2,) οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν καὶ θυμῶμεν, τοτὲ μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος κατὰ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδοθέντα μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τὴν περὶ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν¹ δι' εὐσεβῶν ὕμνων τε καὶ εὐχῶν τῷ Θεῷ προσκομίζοντες· τοτὲ δὲ σφάς αὐτοὺς ὅλῃ καθιεροῦντες αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ γε ἀρχιερεῖ αὐτοῦ

¹ Dr. Waterland translates "our thanksgivings," but the more natural rendering is "the Eucharist."

Λόγῳ, αὐτῷ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἀνακείμενοι. διὰ πάσης μὲν αἰσχροῦργίας τὸ σῶμα ἄχραντον καὶ ἀμίαντον αὐτῷ φυλάττειν ἀσκούμεν· πάντος δὲ πάθους καὶ κηλίδος ἀπάσης τῆς ἀπὸ κακίας κεκαθαρμένην τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῷ προσκομίζομεν· λογισμοῖς τε ἀδιαπτῶτοις καὶ διαθέσει ἀνυποκρίτῳ, δόγμασι τε ἀληθείας, εὐσεβοῦμεν αὐτόν. ἀρεστὰ γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτα εἶναι, μᾶλλον ἢ θυσιῶν πλήθος αἵματι καὶ καπνῷ καὶ κνίσσαις ἐπιτελευμένων πεπαιδευμένα.

Dem. Ev., Lib. viii. Cap. i. ad fin.

Πάλιν ἀπορρήτως τῆς καινῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διαθήκης τὰ μυστήρια ἡγοῦμαι περιέχειν τὴν γοῦν εὐφροσύνην τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μυστικοῦ οἴνου, οὗ παραδέδωκεν αὐτὸς τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς λέγων, “λάβετε πίετε, τοῦτο μοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ αἶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, τοῦτο ποῖετε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν,” δοκεῖ μοι σημαίνειν τὸ “χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ οἴνου” καὶ τὸ “λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα” τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ καθαρὸν τῆς μυστηριώδους τροφῆς· πάλιν γὰρ αὐτὸς τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ἐνθέου οἰκονομίας τοῖς αὐτοῦ παρεδίδου μαθηταῖς, τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακελευόμενος· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκέτι τὰς δι’ αἱματῶν θυσίας, οὐδὲ τὰς παρὰ Μωσεί ἐν διαφύρων ζώων σφαγαῖς νενομοθετημένας προσέτιο, ἄρτῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι συμβῶλῳ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος παρεδίδου, εἰκότως τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ καθαρὸν ᾗνίξατο τῆς τροφῆς εἰπὼν “καὶ λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντας αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα” τούτου καὶ ἄλλος ἐμνημόνευσεν προφήτης, φήσας “θυσίαν καὶ προσφερὰν οὐκ ἐθέλῃσας σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι.”

De Vita Constantini, Lib. iv. Cap. 45.

Οἱ δὲ μὴ διὰ τούτων χωρεῖν οἰοί τε, θυσίαις ἀναίμοις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἱεουργίαις τὸ θεῖον ἰδίσκοντο, ὑπὲρ τῆς καινῆς εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὐτοῦ δὲ βασιλεῶς παιδῶν τ’ αὐτοῦ θεοφιλῶν, ἱκετηρίους εὐχὰς τῷ Θεῷ προσανεφέροντες. (The Intercessions of the Eucharist are clearly meant.)

Eccl. Hist., x. 3.

καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν προηγουμένων ἐντελεῖς θρησκείαι, ἱεουργίας τε τῶν ἱερωμένων, καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς ἐκκλησίας θεσμοὶ, ὧδε μὲν ψαλμωδίαις

καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς τῶν θεόθεν ἡμῖν παραδοθεισῶν φωνῶν ἀκροάσασιν, ὧδε δὲ θείαις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἐπιτελουμέναις διακονίαις· Σωτηρίου τε ἢ πάθους ἀπόρρητα σύμβολα. (Bright's ed., Oxford, 1872, p. 332.)

De Laudibus Constantini. (Cap. xvi.)

ἀναίμους δὲ καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας, τὰς δι' εὐχῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτου θεολογίας, τοῖς αὐτοῦ θιασώταις τὶς ἐπιτελεῖν παρέδωκεν ἄλλος, ἢ μόνος ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτὴρ; διὸ ἐπὶ τῆς καθ' ὅλης ἀνθρώπων οἰκουμένης, θυσιαστήρια συνέστη, ἐκκλησιῶν τε ἀφιερώματα, νοερῶν τε καὶ λογικῶν θυσίων ἱεροπρεπεῖς λειτουργίαι.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, (A.D. 350).

Catechisma Mystagog.

Cap. i. ὥσπερ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, πρὸ τῆς ἀγίας ἐπικλήσεως τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος, ἄρτος ἦν καὶ οἶνος λιτός· ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γινομένης, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον, τὰ τοιαῦτα βρώματα τῆς πομπῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ, τῇ ἰδίᾳ φύσει λιτὰ ὄντα, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν δαιμόνων βέβηλα γίνεται.

iv. μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου δίδεται σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδεται σοι τὸ αἷμα . . . μὴ προσέχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ, σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ . . . μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίστewος πληροφοροῦ ἀνευδοκίᾳ τῶν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς.

v. παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλόανθρωπον Θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκειμένα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ, πάντως γὰρ οὐ ἕαν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγιάσται καὶ μεταβέβηται. εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀνάμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ θιασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεόν, ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης . . . εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμένων, πρῶτον πατριάρχων, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων [ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξεται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν] εἶτα καὶ

ὑπὲρ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων· μεγίστην ὄνησιν πιστεύοντες ἔσσεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δεήσις ἀναφέρεται, τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης προκείμενης θυσίας . . . καὶ ἀπαξἀπλῶς ὑπὲρ πάντων βοηθείας δεομένων δεόμεθά [σου καὶ ταύτην προσφέρονέν σοι τὴν θυσίαν.]

The change from the third to the second person in the last sentence is highly suspicious, and no one who compares both the passages here bracketed with the Liturgies themselves (in which nothing parallel is found), will hesitate to reject them as spurious. There are many similar changes, as from the plural number to the singular, which suggest a suspicion of two different works; and Bishop Andrewes was one of those who conceive that these Lectures, as they stand, are not Cyril's. (Answer to Card. Perron, p. 36. See Goode, p. 481.)

Further on is the much-cited direction on the manner of receiving, one of those in which the singular number is used:—

τὴν ἀριστερὰν θρόνον ποιήσας τῇ δεξιᾷ, ὡς μελλούσῃ βασιλείᾳ ὑποδέχεσθαι, καὶ κοίλανος τὴν παλάμην, δέχου τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐπιλέγων τὸ ἄμην. εἶτα προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ . . . κύπτων καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος, λέγων τὸ ἄμην.

AMBROSE, (A.D. 374).

De iis qui Mysteriorum initiantur, or *De Mysteriorum*. [Though usually quoted in the name of S. Ambrose, this work is probably a part of the *De Sacramentis*, which is generally allowed to be by another writer. See Casimir Oudin, quoted in Dean Goode, "Nature of Christ's Presence," (1856,) p. 493.]

"Vera utique caro Christi quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est: vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus *hoc est corpus meum*. Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem Corpus significatur. Ipse dicit sanguinem suum;

ante consecrationem aliud dicitur, post consecrationem Sanguis nuncupatur. Et tu dicis *Amen*, hoc est, verum est; quod os loquitur mens interna fateatur; quod sermo sonat affectus sentiat. . . In illo sacramento Christus est quia Corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca sed spiritalis est; unde Apostolus de typo ejus ait (cites 1 Cor. x. 3, 4). Corpus enim Dei Corpus est spiritale: corpus Christi corpus est Divini Spiritus, quia Spiritus est Christus."

In Psalmum xxxviii. (nobis xxxix.), v. 6. "Primum igitur umbra præcessit, secuta est imago, erit veritas. Umbra in lege, imago vero in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Umbra Evangelii et Ecclesiæ congregationis in Lege, imago futuræ veritatis in Evangelio, veritas in judicio Dei. Ergo quæ nunc celebrantur in Ecclesia eorum umbra erat in sermonibus prophetarum: umbra in diluvio, umbra in Rubro Mari &c., umbra in petra quæ aquam fluxit et populum sequebatur. . . Nonne illud in umbra erat sacrosancti hujus mysterii sacramentum? Nonne in umbra erat aqua de petra, quasi sanguis ex Christo, quæ fugientes se populos sequebatur ut biberent et non sitirent, redimerentur et non perirent. Sed jam discessit umbra noctis et caliginis Judæorum, dies appropinquavit Ecclesiæ. Videmus per imaginem bona, et tenemus imaginis bona. Vidimus Principem sacerdotum, vidimus et audivimus offerentem pro nobis sanguinem suum: sequimur ut possumus sacerdotes; ut offeramus pro populo sacrificium; etsi infirmi merito tamen honorabiles sacrificio, . . quia etsi nunc Christus non videtur offerre, tamen ipse offertur in terris, quando Christi corpus offertur; immo ipse offerre manifestatur in nobis, cujus sermo sanctificat sacrificium quod offertur. Et ipse quidem nobis apud Patrem advocatus assistit: sed nunc eum non videmus, tunc videbimus cum imago transierit, veritas venerit. Tunc jam non per speculum sed facie ad faciem ea quæ sunt perfecta videbuntur. Ascende ergo, homo, in cœlum et videbis illa quorum umbra hic est imago."

De Officiis, Lib. i. c. 48.

"Hic umbra, hic imago, illic veritas; umbra in Lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur et vitulus, nunc Christus offertur, sed offertur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem, et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem quasi advocatus noster intervenit."

S. AUGUSTINE, (A.D. 395).

Contra Faustum, xx. 21.

"Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post ascensum Christi per sacramentum memoria celebratur."

Ad Dard., Liber de Præsentia Dei, (seu Ep. 187).

Cap. iii. "Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum unde venturus est . . . cui (carni) profecto immortalitatem dedit naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis ut veritatem corporis auferamus. C. 6. Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus et nusquam erunt, et quia nusquam erunt nec erunt. C. 13. Ubique totum præsentem esse non dubites tanquam Deus et in eodem templo Dei esse, tanquam inhabitantem Deum et in loco aliquo cœli propter veri corporis modum."

In Johannis Evang., Tract. xxx. 1.

1. "Sursum est Dominus: sed etiam hic est veritas Dominus (Domini?) Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexit uno loco esse potest (oportet) veritas ejus ubique diffusa est," ["Oportet" is the reading of the Decretals, and of Thomas Aquinas. See Note of the Benedictine Editor, iv. p. 517.]

In Johannem, Tract. i.

“Semper quidem divinitate nobiscum est: sed nisi corporaliter abiret a nobis, semper ejus corpus carnaliter videremus, et nunquam spiritaliter crederemus. . . . Secundum præsentiam pulcritudinis et divinitatis suæ semper cum Patre est; secundum præsentiam corporalem jam supra cœlos ad dexteram Patris est; secundum præsentiam vero fidei in omnibus Christianis est.”

Contra Adamantium, c. xii.

3. “Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.”

De Trinitate, Lib. iii. c. 4.

“Nec linquam quippe ejus, nec membranam, nec atramentum, nec significantes sonos linguæ editos, nec signa literarum conscripta pelliculis, corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus; sed illud tantum quod ex frugibus terræ acceptum et prece mystica consecratum, rite sumimus ad salutem spiritalem, in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis; quod cum per manus hominum ad illam visibilem speciem perducatur, non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.”

In Johannis Evang., Tract. xlv.

9. “Significata ergo sunt omnia: numquid non eadem credebant, per quos hæc signa ministrabantur, per quos eadem quæ credimus prophetata prænuntiabantur? Utique credebant; sed illi ventura esse, nos autem venisse. Ideo et sic ait eundem potum spiritalem biberunt. Spiritalem eundem, nam corporalem non eundem. Quod enim illi bibebant? Bibebant enim de spiritali sequente petra; petra autem erat Christus. Videte ergo, fide manente, signa variata. Ibi petra Christus, nobis Christus quod in altari Dei ponitur.

Et illi pro magno sacramento ejusdem Christi biberunt aquam profluentem de petra, nos quid bibamus norunt fideles. Si speciem visibilem intendas, aliud est: si intelligibilem significationem, eundem potum spiritalem biberunt."

Enarratio in Psalmum xcviii., (nobis xcix.) v. 9.

"Tunc autem quando hoc Dominus commendavit, de carne sua locutus erat et dixerat, *Nisi quis manducaverit*, &c. . . . durum illis visum est Ipsi erant duri non sermo quia est ibi aliquod sacramentum latens. . . . Ille autem instruxit eos et ait illis, Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro autem nihil prodest: verba quæ locutus sum vobis, spiritus est et vita. Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum: non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod commendavi, spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos; etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari oportet tamen invisibile intelligi."

In Johannis Evang., Tract. xxvi.

11. "Aliud est sacramentum, aliud virtus sacramenti.

12. Hic est ergo *panis de cælo descendens, ut si quis manducaverit ex ipso non moriatur*. Sed quod pertinet ad virtutem sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile sacramentum; qui manducat intus, non foris: qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem; etiamsi tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducet et bibat."

[This is the reading of *all* the MSS. consulted by the Benedictine Editors. In the printed text, the word "spiritualiter" is interpolated after "manducat," and "licet carnaliter et visibiliter premit dentibus sacramentum corporis et san-

guinis Christi sed magis," are read instead of the single word "etiamsi." Hence the citation in our XXIXth Article.]

De Diversis Quæstionibus Octaginta tribus, Quæst. lxi.

"Ita Dominus noster Jesus Christus ostenditur rex noster. Ipse est etiam sacerdos noster in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedec, qui se ipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suæ passionis memoriam commendavit, ut illud quod Melchisedec obtulit Deo, jam per totum orbem terrarum in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri."

De Civitate Dei, Liber x.

Cap. v. "Nec quod ab antiquis patribus talia sacrificia facta sunt in victimis pecorum, quæ nunc Dei populus legit, non facit, aliud intelligendum est nisi rebus illis eas res fuisse significatas quæ aguntur in nobis, ad hoc ut inhæreamus Deo, et ad eundem finem proximo consulamus. Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum, est. . . . In epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos *bene facere* inquit &c., (xiii. 16, and Hos. vi. 6). Nihil aliud quam sacrificio sacrificium prælatum oportet intelligi^{*}: quoniam illud quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium signum est veri sacrificii. Porro autem misericordia verum sacrificium est. . . . (vi.) Profecto efficitur ut tota ipsa redempta Civitas, hoc est, conjugatio societasque sanctorum, universale sacrificium offeratur Deo, per Sacerdotem magnum, qui etiam se ipsum obtulit in passione pro nobis, ut tanti capitis corpus essemus, secundum formam servi. Hanc enim obtulit, in hac oblatus est, quia secundum hanc mediator est, in hac Sacerdos, in hac Sacrificium est."

^{*} Though I have again followed Dr. Harrison's translation, the words would be better rendered, "nothing else is to be understood but that one sacrifice is preferred to another."

Idem, Lib. xvii.

Cap. v. (citing 1 Sam. ii. 36.) “Quod ergo addidit *manducare panem* etiam ipsum sacrificii genus eleganter expressit, de quo dicit Sacerdos ipse *panis quem ego dedit, caro mea est pro sæculi vita*. Ipsum est sacrificium non secundum ordinem Aaron sed secundum ordinem Melchisedec; qui legit intelligat, . . . *manducare panem*, quod est in Novo Testamento sacrificium Christianorum.”

CHRYSTOSTOM, (A.D. 398).

In Ephes., Hom. iii. Εἰκὴ θυσία καθημερινή, εἰκὴ παραστήκαμεν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· οὐδεὶς ὁ μετέχων. ταῦτα οὐκ ἵνα ἀπλῶς μετέχητε λέγω, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἀξίους ἑαυτοὺς κατασκευάζητε· οὐκ εἰ τῆς θυσίας ἄξιος, οὐδὲ τῆς μεταλήψεως; οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τῆς εὐχῆς· ἀκούεις ἐστῶτος τοῦ κήρυκος, καὶ λέγοντος, ὅσοι ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἀπέλθετε πάντες· ὅσοι μὴ μετέχουσιν ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰσὶν· εἰ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰ μετέχειν οὐκ ὀφείλεις· ὁ γὰρ μὴ μετέχων τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἐστί· τίνας οὖν ἔνεκεν λέγει, ἀπέλθετε οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι δεηθῆναι; σὺ δὲ ἔστηκας ἰταμῶς; ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰ τούτων, ἀλλὰ τῶν δυναμένων μετέχειν, καὶ οὐδὲν φροντίζεις; οὐδὲν ἡγῇ τὸ πρᾶγμα;

. . . οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, διὰ τί κατακλίθης; ἀλλὰ τί εἰσῆλθης; ταῦτα καὶ νῦν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς διαλέγεται τοὺς ἀναισχύντως καὶ ἰταμῶς ἐστῶτας· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μὴ μετέχων τῶν μυστηρίων ἀνασχυντος καὶ ἰταμῶς ἐστηκώς . . . εἰπέ μοι, εἴ τις εἰς ἐστίαισιν κληθεῖς, τὰς χεῖρας νίψαιτο, καὶ κατακλιθεῖν, καὶ ἑτοιμος γένοιτο πρὸς τὴν τράπεζαν, εἴτα μὴ μετέχοι, οὐκ ὑβρίζει τὸν καλέσαντα; οὐ βέλτιον τὸν τοιοῦτον μηδὲ παραγενέσθαι; οὕτω δὴ καὶ σὺ παραγέγονας· τὸν ὕμνον ᾗσας, μετὰ πάντων ὡμολόγησας εἶναι τῶν ἀξίων, τῷ μὴ μετὰ τῶν ἀναξίων ἀνακεχωρηκέναι· πῶς ἔμεινας, καὶ οὐ μετέχεις τῆς τραπέζης; ἀνάξιος εἰμι, φησὶν· οὐκοῦν καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκείνης τῆς ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς· οὐ γὰρ διὰ προκειμένων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν φθῶν ἐκείνων τὸ Πνεῦμα πάντοθεν κάτεισιν . . . ἀνάξιοι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν θεαμάτων τούτων, ἀνάξιοι καὶ ἀκοαί. . . . ὅταν μέντοι παρῇ ἀπιθι· οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατηχουμένῳ. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἴσον

μηδέπω τυχεῖν μυστηρίων καὶ μετὰ τὸ τυχεῖν προσκρούσαντα καταφρονεῖν, καὶ ἀνάξιον ἑαυτὸν καταστήσαι τοῦ πράγματος.

De proditione Judæ. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸς· σχῆμα πληρῶν ἔστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰ ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκείνα· ἡ δὲ δύναμις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ. Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά, φησι· τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταρρύθμιζει τὰ προκείμενα. καὶ καθάπερ ἡ φωνὴ ἐκείνη ἡ λέγουσα, αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε. . . ἐρέθη μὲν ἀπαξ, διὰ πάντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου γίνεται ἔργῳ, ἐνδυναμοῦσα τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμέτεραν πρὸς παιδοποιίαν· οὕτω καὶ φωνὴ αὕτη, ἀπαξ λεχθεῖσα, καθ' ἐκάστην τράπεζαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι σήμερον καὶ μέχρι τῆς αὐτῇ παρουσίας, τὴν θυσίαν ἀπηρτισμένην ἐργάζεται.

De Prod. Jud., i. 6. ἐσφαγμένος πρόκειται ὁ Χριστός. *Ad prop. Ant., Hom. xv.* ἔνθα ὁ Χριστὸς κεῖται τεθυμένος. *In Act. Apost., Hom xxxi.* ἐν χερσίν ἡ θυσία, καὶ πάντα πρόκειται ἡντρεπισμένα. . . τοῦ Δεσπότου παρόντος, τοῦ θανάτου ἐπιτελουμένου ἐκείνου, τῆς φρικτῆς θυσίας, τῶν ἀφάτων μυστηρίων. *De Coeet., v. 3.* ὡς ἀμὼν ἐσφαγμένον καὶ τεθυμένον. *De xepit., Hom. ix.* τοῦ αἵματος ἐν τῷ κρατῆρι εἰς σὴν κάθαρσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀχράντου πλευρᾶς κενουμένου. *De Sacerd., iii. 4.* Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδῃς τὸν Κύριον τεθυμένον καὶ κείμενον. . . καὶ πάντας ἐκείνῳ τῷ τιμῷ φοινισσομένους αἵματι.

In Epist. primam ad Corinth., Hom. xxiv. 3.

Ὅπου γὰρ τὸ πτώμα, φησιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ· πτώμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐκείνος ἔπεσεν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἀνέστημεν· ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, δεικνύς ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν προσίοντα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ . . . ἀετῶν γὰρ, οὐ κολοῖων αὐτῇ ἡ τράπεζα.

In Hebraeos.

Hom. xi. Χρὴ τοίνυν καὶ τοὺς ὧν ἐστιν ἱερεὺς σφόδρα εἶναι βελτίους· καὶ ὥσπερ πολὺ τὸ μέσον Ἀαρῶν δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοσοῦτον ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸ μέσον· ὅρα γὰρ ἄνω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἄνω τὸν ἱερέα, ἄνω τὴν θυσίαν· οὐκοῦν τοιαύτας ἀναφέρωμεν

θυσίας τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῳ δυναμένας προσφέρεισθαι τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· οὐκ ἐτι πρόβατα δὲ βόας· οὐκ ἐτι αἷμα καὶ κνίσσῃν· πάντα ταῦτα λέλυνται· καὶ ἀντεισενέκεται ἀντὶ τούτων ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία· τί δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία; τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς· τὰ διὰ πνεύματος· πνεῦμα, φησιν, ὁ Θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ χρὴ προσκυνεῖν.

Hom. xiii. Μὴ τοίνυν αὐτὸν ἱερέα ἀκούσας αἰεὶ ἱεράσθαι νομίξε· ἀπαξ γὰρ ἱεράσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκάθισεν. ἵνα γὰρ μὴ νομίσης ἄνω ἐστάναι αὐτὸν καὶ λειτουργὸν εἶναι, δείκνυσιν ὅτι οἰκονομίας τὸ πᾶγμα ἐστίν· ὥσπερ γὰρ δοῦλος ἐγένετο, οὕτω καὶ ἱερεὺς, καὶ λειτουργός· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ δοῦλος γενόμενος οὐκ ἔμεινε λειτουργός. οὐ γὰρ λειτουργοῦ τὸ καθῆσθαι ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐστάναι· τοῦτο οὖν αἰνίττεται ἐνταῦθα τῆς θυσίας τὸ μεγαλεῖον· ἡ ἤρκεσε μία οὐσα, καὶ ἀπαξ προσενεχθεῖσα, τοσοῦτον ὅσον αἱ πᾶσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσαν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἄνω καὶ κάτω, στρέφει λέγων, ἕνα ἱερέα, μίαν θυσίαν· ἵνα μή τις νομίζων πολλὰς εἶναι ἀδεῶς ἁμαρτάνῃ.

Hom. xvii. Οὕτω δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπαξ προσενεχθείς· ὑπὸ τίνος προσενεχθείς; ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ δηλονότι· ἐνταῦθα οὐδὲ ἱερέα δείκνυσιν αὐτὸν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ θῦμα δὲ ἱερεῖον. . . . τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· καὶ μία ἐστὶν αὕτη, καὶ οὐ πολλαί. πῶς μία καὶ οὐ πολλαί; ἐπειδὴ ἀπαξ προσηνέχθη, ὥσπερ ἐκείνη ἡ εἰς τὰ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων· τοῦτο ἐκείνης τύπος ἐστὶ, καὶ αὕτη ἐκείνης. τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰεὶ προσφέρομεν· οὐ νῦν μὲν ἕτερον πρόβατον, αὔριον δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸ αὐτό· ὥστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία. ἐπεὶ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦτω, ἐπειδὴ πολλαχοῦ προσφερέται καὶ πολλοὶ Χριστοί; ἀλλ' οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλ' εἰς πανταχοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐνταῦθα πλήρης ὢν, δὲ ἐκεῖ πλήρης, ἐν σώμα· ὥσπερ οὖν πολλαχοῦ προσφερόμενος ἐν σώμα ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ πολλὰ σώματα, οὕτω δὲ μία θυσία. ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ τὴν θυσίαν τὴν καθαίρουσαν ἡμᾶς προσενεγκών. ἐκείνην προσφέρομεν καὶ νῦν τὴν τότε τε προσενεχθεῖσαν, τὴν ἀναλώτοσαν. τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γὰρ τοῦ τότε γενομένου. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτέ, φησιν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰεὶ ποιούμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

Additional Homilies on S. Matthew.

(Matt. v. 22.) "Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est (in quibus non est verum Corpus Christi, sed mysterium Corporis ejus continetur) quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quod vult."

N.B. These words are from one of fifty-four "additional Homilies," included by the French Jesuit, Fronton le Duc, in his Greek and Latin edition of S. Chrysostom, which was completed by Charles Morel, and published at Paris, 1636. They are not found in the Savile or Benedictine editions, and are described by le Duc (Ducæus) as "incerti auctoris imperfectum opus," and "Chrysostomianæ linguæ et menti magis contraria quam ignem et aquam." They are further charged with the heresies of Montanus, Manichæus, Arius, Donatus, and Pelagius (!), for which Paul IV. put them in the suspected list, and Paul V. had them expurgated. Whatever ground there may be for these censures, the Homilies are clearly not S. Chrysostom's, being a Commentary on the *Vulgate*, which he never uses, and doubtless originally written in Latin. It must be added, that the passage enclosed in the parenthesis is wanting in some copies, and was probably inserted by a later critic, who failed to observe that the *vasa* referred to were not the Eucharistic vessels, but the "calices sacratas" of the Temple, which Belshazzar polluted at his banquet. As an authority, therefore, the passage is worthless; still it may serve to shew that at a much later period than Chrysostom's, and in the Latin Church, the Corporal tenet was so far from being generally accepted, that the "excellent Ducæus" himself could edit a statement that the Paten and Chalice "do not contain the true Body, but the mystery of it;"—exactly what Bishop Ridley said.

S. CHRYSOSTOM ON Psalm xciv. (νοβίς_xcvi.)

Ὅρα τῶς λαμπρῶς καὶ περιφανῶς τὴν μυστικὴν ἡρμήνευσε τράπεζαν, τὴν ἀνάμακτον θυσίαν. Θυμίαμα δὲ λέγει καθαρὸν τὴν προσευχὴν τὴν ἁγίαν τὴν μετὰ τῆς θυσίας ἀναφερομένην. Ἐκεῖνο γὰρ Θεὸν ἀναπαύει τὸ θυμίαμα, οὐ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ῥιζῶν γήινων λαμβανόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀπὸ καθαρῆς καρδίας ἀναπεμπόμενον θυμίαμα. Κατευθιθῆτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου. ὁρᾷς ὅπως πανταχοῦ διαλάμπειν ἐπιτρέπεται τῇ λειτουργίᾳ ἀγγελικῇ; ὁρᾷς ὅπως οὐ περιώρισται οὔτε τὸ θυσιαστήριον, οὔτε τὸ ἄσμα, ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσφέρεται τῷ ὀνόματί μου. Ἔστι μὲν οὖν θυσία καθαρὰ, πρώτη μὲν ἡ μυστικὴ τράπεζα, τὸ οὐράνιον, τὸ ὑπερκόσμιον θῆμα. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν διαφορά πολλῶν θυσιῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ νόμος εἶχε πολλὰς θυσίας ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ καὶ τὴν μὲν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν δὲ ὀλοκαύτωμα λεγομένην, καὶ τὴν μὲν αἰνέσεως, τὴν δὲ σωτηρίου, ἄλλην ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων λεπτῶν, καὶ ἄλλας πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μυρίοις μιάσμασιν ἐξεταζομένων. καὶ πολλὸς ἤ καὶ ἄμετρος ἀριθμὸς θυσιῶν τῶν κατὰ νόμον, ἡ νέα χάρις ἐλθοῦσα διὰ μιᾶς περιγράφει πάσας, καὶ μίαν ἀληθινὴν ἔστησε θυσίαν . . . ἔχεις οὖν πρώτην θυσίαν τὸ σωτήριον δῶρον· δευτέραν τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων· τρίτην τὴν τῆς προσευχῆς· τετάρτην τὴν τοῦ ἀλαλαγοῦ· πέμπτην τὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης· ἕκτην τὴν τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης· ἐβδόμην τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως· ὀγδόην τὴν τῆς κατανύξεως· ἐνάτην τὴν τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης· δεκάτην τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος.

N.B. The translation at p. 374 was copied from Dr. Harrison (ii. 178.) The second sentence should be, "He calls the holy prayer offered with the sacrifice (the Eucharist) pure incense. For that incense is refreshing to God, not which is taken from earthly plants, but the incense arising from pure hearts." Further on, instead of "world-wide," should be read "supramundane," or perhaps "for all the world."

In Matt., Hom. xxv. διὰ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ φρικτῶδη μυστήρια τὰ πολλὰς γέμοντα τῆς σωτηρίας, τὰ καθ' ἐκάστην τελούμενα [λέγω] σύναξιν, Εὐχαριστία καλεῖται, ὅτι πολλῶν ἐστὶν εὐεργετημάτων ἀνά-

μνησις, καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας ἐνδείκνυται, καὶ διὰ πάντων παρασκευάζει εὐχαριστεῖν.

In Epist. ad Galat., chap. v. 17. τῷ δὲ τῆς σαρκὸς ὀνόματι πάλιν, καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καλεῖν εἶωθεν ἡ γραφή, καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἅπασαν, σῶμα λέγουσα εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Hom. xviii., in *Secundam Epistolam ad Corinth.*

"Ἔστι δὲ ὅπου οὐδὲ διέστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἀρχομένου· οἶον, ὅταν ἀπολαύειν δέῃ τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων· ὁμοίως γὰρ πάντες ἀξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν. οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς, τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤσθιε τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος. καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὧν μετεῖχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς. ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σῶμα πρόκειται, καὶ ποτήριον ἓν. καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς δὲ πολὺ τὸν λαόν ἴδοι τις ἂν συνεισφέροντα . . . ἐπειδὴν εἴρωμεν τῶν ἱερῶν περιβόλων τοὺς οὐ δυναμένους τῆς ἱερᾶς μετασχεῖν τραπέζης, ἑτέραν δεῖ γένεσθαι εὐχὴν, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπ' ἐδάφους κείμεθα, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἀνιστάμεθα. ὅταν εἰρήνης πάλιν μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ μεταδιδόναι δέῃ πάντε ὁμοίως ἀσπαζόμεθα. ἐπ' αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν φρικωδεστάτων μυστηρίων ἐπεύχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ λαῷ, ἐπεύχεται καὶ ὁ λαὸς τῷ ἱερεῖ. τὸ γάρ, μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ τοῦτο. τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας πάλιν κοινά. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος εὐχαριστεῖ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὅπας. προτέρων γὰρ αὐτῶν λαβὼν φωνήν, εἶτα συντιθεμένων ὅτι ἀξίως καὶ δικαίως τοῦτο γίνεται, τότε ἀρχεται τῆς εὐχαριστίας. καὶ τὶ θαυμάζεις εἴ που μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ λαὸς φθέγγεται, ὅπου γὰρ μετ' αὐτῶν τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων κοινῇ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἐκείνους ὕμνους ἀναπέμπει;

[This testimony is conclusive for (1) a common language, (2) communion in both kinds, (3) the entire exclusion of non-communicants.]

INDEX OF NAMES.

A.

AARON, 29, 102
Abel, 16, 17, 412
Abraham, 18
Agde, Council, 255
Alasco, John, 396
Albertinus, 8
Alcuin, 293
Aldrich, Dean, 195, 225
Alexandria, 248, 261, 274
Allix, 88
Altar, 401, 403
Amandus, Polanus, 8
Ambrose, S., 13, 361, 495
American Lit., 434, 437
Anamnesis, 50: see Remembrance
Ancyra, Council, 245, 458
Andrewes, Bp., 36, 76, 102, 175, 240, 342, 447
Anselm, Abp., 387
Antioch, Council, 248, 459
Apostolical Canons, 244, 245, 457
 — Constitutions, 246
Aquinas, T., 15, 76, 95, 111, 445
Armenian Heresy, 246, 445
Arnobius, 289
Articles, Church of E., 107, 405
Athanasius, S., 64, 101, 412
Athenagoras, 330, 483
Augsburgh, Confession, 115
Augustine, Abp., 257, 292, 386
 — S., 2, 8, 15, 63, 88, 90, 127, 143, 301, 302, 366, 450, 497
Azkarah, 20, 51: see Remembrance

B.

Balsamon, Pat., 249
Barlow, Bp., 174
Barnabas, Ap., 101, 315

Baronius, Card., 442
Basil, S., 68, 256, 261, 343
 — Liturgy, 271, 468
Beatoun, Card., 398
Beaufort, Card., 132.
Becon, T., 405
Bellarmino, Card., 10, 55, 74, 95, 110, 112, 323
Bengel, 52, 58
Berengarina, 158
Bertram, 158
Beveridge, Bp., 198
Beza, 8
Bilson, Bp., 171, 239
Bingham, R., 205, 255
Bona, Card., 82, 442
Bossuet, Bp., 112, 409
Bracara, Council, 78, 462
Bramhall, Abp., 93, 183
Bramley, H. R., 421
Brett, Dr., 263, 280, 302, 426
Brevint, Dr., 193
Browne, Bp., 329
Bruns, Dr., 457
Bucer, M., 407, 425
Buel, Dr., xii., 181
Bull, Bp., 197
Bullinger, H., 398
Bunsen, Baron, 215, 264
Burnet, Bp., 198

C.

Cain, 16
Cajetan, Card., 74
Calvin, J., 8, 9, 55, 57, 120, 121, 397, 442
Carthage, C., 285, 347, 462,
Catechism, Church, 224
 — Trent, 86, 109
Chichele, Abp., 132
Chrysostom, S., 9, 20, 94, 261, 304, 371, 501

- Chrysostom, S., Liturgy, 273, 470
 Church Quarterly Review, ix.
 Cicero, 75
 Clara, Sancta, 107
 Clement of Alexandria, 101, 248, 332, 483
 — Rome, 107, 311, 474
 Clementine Liturgy, 255, 263, 267, 284, 465
 Cobb, G. F., xv., 222
 Co-existence, 115, 222
 Communion, vii.
 Concomitance, 84
Concordie, Formula, 120, 123
Consistentes, 248
 Constance, Council, 79
 Constantinople, Council, 278
 Consubstantiation, 115
 Cooke, Sir A., 168
 Cosin, Bp., 75, 117, 191, 447
 Courayer, 409
 Cranmer, Abp., 15, 57, 135, 162, 398, 402, 404, 425
 Cyprian, S., 13, 101, 345, 490
 Cyril of Alex., 262
 — Jerusalem, 152, 283, 357, 494
- D.
- Damascenus, John, ix.
 Damianus, P., 80
 D'Aubigné, Dr., 397, 409
 De Dominis, M. A., 12
 De Maistre, 444
 De Valois: see Valesius
 Diallacticon, 168
 Diognetus, 315
 Dionysius, Bp., 247
 Diptycha, 284
 Dodwell, H., 289
 Döllinger, Dr., 381
 Drake, C. B., 313, 330, 339, 341, 417
 Drey, Dr., 256, 457
 Droop, H. R., 394
 Ducæus, 504
 Du Pin, 293
 Durandus, 88
- E.
- Elfric, Abp., 155
 Elvira, Council, 248
- Ephrem Syrus, 304
 Epiphanius, Bp., 304
 Erasmus, 161
 Eucharist, vii.
 Eusebius, Alex., 252
 — Cæs., Bp., 101, 263, 354, 414, 491
 — Emiss., 304
 Evangelicals, 398
- F.
- Faulkner, R. C., 325
 Fell, Bp., 196
 Ferrars, Bp., 136
 Ferrier, Prof., 215
 Fichte, 215
 Fie d, Dean, 93, 294
 Florence, Council, 279, 305
 Foxe, 401
 Frankfort, Council, 279
 Freeman, Archd., xi., xvi., 159, 239, 261, 267, 306
- G.
- Gardiner, Bp., 224, 425
 Gelasius, Pope, 178, 293
 Geneva, 397, 406, 443
 Gerhard, 124
 Gibson, Bp., 88, 310
 Goode, Dean, 58, 168, 495
 Grabe, Dr., 8, 263, 331
 Gray, Abp., 131
 Gregory I., Pope, 257, 292, 301
 — Naz., 304, 440
 — Nyss., 63, 304
 Grenada, Abp. of, 97
 Grindal, Abp., 443
- H.
- Hammond, Dr., 193
 Harrison, Dr., 368, 500, 505
 Hart, Pr., xii., 434
 Hefele, Bp., 244, 256, 264, 288
 Henry VIII., 135, 162, 388
 Herman, Abp., 407
 Hermas, 101, 315
 Hilary, Bp., 144
 Holbeck, Bp., 136
 Homer, 18

Hook, Dr., xi., 132, 435
 Hooker, R., 11, 127, 148, 227, 238
 Hooper, Bp., 391, 396, 401
 Horace, 75
 Horsley, Bp., 431

I.

Ignatius, S., 101, 258, 314, 475
 Incense, 288
 Irenæus, S., 101, 258, 317, 478

J.

James, S., Lit., 256, 261, 269, 466
 Jerome, S., 99, 101, 351
 Jewel, Bp., 14, 140, 173
 John of Paris, 115
 Johnson, John, 203, 206, 242, 263, 426
 Josephus, 20, 21, 26, 33, 412
 Jowett, Dr., 7, 421
 Justin, M., 6, 101, 258, 315, 475

K.

Kant, 215
 Keble, John, 87, 229
 Kerfoot, Bp., xii.
 Kilwardby Card., 132
 Knox, John, 395, 399, 403, 405, 443

L.

Lake, Bp., 183
 Lanfranc, Abp., 158
 Langham, Card., 132
 Langton, Card., 132
 Laodicea, Council, 245, 250, 461
 Lateran, Council, 81
 Latimer, Bp., 403, 406
 Laud, Abp., 182, 428, 443
 Leo I., Pope, 63, 78, 293
 L'Estrange, 415
 Littlejohn, Bp., xii.
 Liturgy, Divine, vii.
 Lombard, Peter, 95, 135
 Lord's Supper, vii., 286
 Lorimer, Dr., 396, 398
 Lucretius, 2
 Luthardt, 130
 Luther, M., 8, 55, 114, 393, 442
 Lyman, Bp., xii.

M.

McCaul, J. B., 69, 70
 MacLaine, Dr., 409
 Maimonides, 444
 Malachi, 6, 10, 17, 102
 Malan, S. C., 444
 Maldonatus, viii., 286
 Mark, Bp., 280
 — S., Lit., 256, 261, 274, 471
 Martin, Pope, 131
 Martyr, P., 404
 Mary, Q., 402
 Maskell, W., 387
 Mass, vii. : see Missal
 Massuet, 323
 Maundy Thursday, 286
 Mede, Joseph, 185, 214, 421
 Meænathon, 8, 120, 407
 Melchior, Canus, 112
 Melchisedek, 99, 102, 334, 350, 369
 Memorial, 20, 22, 23 : see Remembrance
 Milman, Dean, 158, 291
 Milton, W., 110
 Missa, 255
 Mi-sa', Roman, 294
 Moberly, Bp., v.
 Montfaucon, 262
 Morton, Bp., 214, 421
 Moses, 25, 30

N.

Neale, Dr., 263, 290
 Nicæa, General Council, 245, 246, 460
 Noah, 17
 Nonjurors, 428, 430
 Northumberland, Duke, 406

O.

Objective, ix, 213
 Olshausen, 118
 Oriental Liturgy, 261
 Origen, 69, 101, 335, 485
 Orleans Council, 255
 Osiander, 398
 Osmund, Bp., 386
 Overall, Bp., 18

P.

- Palmer, Sir W., 112, 261, 265, 268.
 291, 439, 448, 450
 Parker, Abp., 442
 Paschal, Pope, 78
 Paschasius, Radbert, 158
 Pasover 22, 42, 43
 Patrick, Bp., 189, 310, 412, 419
 Patteson, Bp., 235
 Pearson, Bp., 63, 214, 263, 315
 Perron, Card., 74, 447
 Perry, T. W., 404
 Peter, S., Lit., 258, 291
 Pfaff C. M., 8, 119, 125, 126, 292,
 323, 394
 Philo, 33
 Polycarp, S., 101, 292, 315
 Ponet, Bp., 171
 Priest, 28
 Protestants, 398
 Purgatory, 287
 Pusey, Dr., 143, 222, 325
 Pyncheon, Pr., xii.

Q.

- Quinisext Council, 246
 ——— Canons : see Trullo,
 Council

R.

- Ratherius, Bp., 247
 Ratramn : see Bertram
 Redman, Dr., 416
 Remembrance (or Memorial), 14,
 20, 22, 23, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54,
 337, 439, 455
 Ridley, Bp., 136, 402
 Robertson, J. C., 447
 Roman Church, 274

S.

- Sarpi, P., 294
 Sarum, Lit., 386
 Savoy, Conf., 384
 Scharpius, 8
 Scott, Bp., 63
 Scottish Lit., 428, 431

- Scotus, Duns, 158
 ——— Erigena, 158
 Scrivener, 196
 Scudamore, W. E., 250, 252, 445
 Scultetus, 394
 Seabury, Bp., xii., 431, 448
 Serapion, 247
 Sharp, Archd., 415
 Skinner, Bp., 431, 432
 Socinus, 121
 Solomon, 412
 Somerset, Duke, 400
 Species, 85, 360, 368
 Strype, 407
 St. Victor, Hugo, 75
 Suarez, 112
 Suther, Bp., 431
 Syropulus, 305

T.

- Targums, 33
 Taylor, Bp., 58, 89, 101, 186, 242
 Tertullian, 101, 289, 342, 489
 Theodore, Abp., 386
 Theophilus, 304
 Theophylact, 5
 Thomson, Abp., xiii., 421
 Thorndike, 196
 Transubstantiation, 80, 93
 Trent, Council, 80, 85, 87, 90, 91,
 96, 103, 106, 282
 Trullo (Const.) (Ecum. Council in,
 72, 246, 248, 283, 462
 Trypho, 315, 477
 Tunstall, Bp., 399

U.

- Urban, Pope, 78

V.

- Valesius, 247, 356
 Vasquez, 112
 Veglia, Bp. of, 97
 Virtual Presence, 122
 Vogan, Dr., 121, 143, 150, 444
 Von Döllinger, Dr., 381
 Von Drey, Dr., 256, 457

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">W.</p> <p>Waddington, Dr., 394, 397, 410</p> <p>Wake, Abp., 88, 121</p> <p>Warham, Abp., 162</p> <p>Waterland, Dr., 8, 10, 56, 77, 121,
122, 199, 203, 327</p> <p>Wheatly, 428</p> <p>Whitehouse, Bp., 431</p> <p>Whittingham, Bp., xii.</p> <p>Wiclif, 159</p> <p>Wilberforce, Archd., viii., 217, 225</p> <p>———— Bp., 191</p> | <p>Williams, Bp., xii., 434</p> <p>Wirtemberg, Confession, 119</p> <p>Wishart, Geo., 899</p> <p>Wolsey, Card., 131, 162</p> <p>Wordsworth, Bp., 16</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Y.</p> <p>York, Abp. of, xiii., 421</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Z.</p> <p>Zonaras, 249</p> <p>Zwingli, 120, 394, 397, 442.</p> |
|---|---|

A SELECTION
FROM
THE PUBLICATIONS
OF
MESSRS. JAS. PARKER AND CO.

BROAD-STREET, OXFORD,
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

NEW BOOKS.

Words of Counsel on some of the Chief
Difficulties of the Day,

X Bequeathed to the Church in the Writings of SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, late Lord Bishop of Winchester. Collected and Arranged by THOMAS VINCENT FOSBURY, M.A., Hon. Chaplain to the Bishop, sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading. Crown 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

The Annals of England :

AN EPITOME OF ENGLISH HISTORY, from Contemporary Writers, the Rolls of Parliament, and other Public Records. A LIBRARY EDITION, revised and enlarged, with additional Woodcuts. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

The Glossary of Architecture Abridged.

A CONCISE GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN GREEK, ROMAN, ITALIAN, AND GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. By JOHN HENRY PARKER, C.B., M.A., F.S.A. A New Edition, revised. Fcap. 8vo., with nearly 500 Illustrations, in ornamental cloth, 7s. 6d.

The Constitutions and Canons
Ecclesiastical of the Church of England,

Referred to their Original Sources, and Illustrated with Explanatory Notes, by MACKENZIE E. C. WALCOTT, B.D., F.S.A., Præcentor and Prebendary of Chichester. Fcap. 8vo., cl., 4s.

Godet's Biblical Studies

X ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Edited by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. LYTTLETON, Rector of Hagley, and Honorary Canon of Worcester. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

Parables and Meditations

For Sundays and Holy Days. Translated from the German by A. GURNEY. Post 8vo., toned paper, cloth, 6s.

Apollon; or, The Way of God.

A Plea for the Religion of Scripture. By A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York. Crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

JAMES PARKER AND CO., OXFORD AND LONDON.

1275.6C.15M

The Apostolical Age.

SERMONS AND ESSAYS ON THE APOSTOLICAL AGE. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, and Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. Third Edition, revised, Crown 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

Words at Communion-time.

Short Sermons preached at Celebrations of Holy Communion. By WALTER FRANCIS ELGIE, M.A., Curate in Charge of Otterbourne, Hants. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

X Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance.
By the late Rev. J. KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. Edited, with a New Preface, by R. F. WILSON, M.A., Vicar of Rownhams, &c. Third Edition, much enlarged, Post 8vo., cloth, 6s.

The First Prayer-book of Edward VI.

With a Correlation of the Subsequent Editions, shewing at One View the Results of the Various Revisions from 1549 to 1662. Crown 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*]

English Country Houses.

SIXTY-ONE VIEWS AND PLANS of recently erected Mansions, Private Residences, Parsonage-Houses, Farm-Houses, Lodges, and Cottages; with Sketches of Furniture and Fittings: and A Practical Treatise on House-Building. By WILLIAM WILKINSON, Architect, Oxford. Second Edition, Royal 8vo., Ornamental Cloth, £1 5s.

The Gospel according to S. John.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. JOHN. By S. CYRIL, Archbishop of Alexandria. Vol. I. S. John i.—viii. With a NOTICE by the Rev. Dr. PUSEY, on the Belief in the Double Procession of the Eastern Church in Earlier Times. (Forming Vol. 43 of the LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS.) 8vo., cloth, 16s.; to Subscribers, 12s.

Sunday-school Exercises,

Collected and Revised from Manuscripts of Burghclere School-children, under the teaching of the Rev. W. B. BARTER, late Rector of Highclere and Burghclere; Edited by his Son-in-law, the BISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS. Second Edition, Crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

The late Mr. Haddan.

THE REMAINS of the late ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Right Rev. A. P. FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

JAMES PARKER AND CO.,

Daniel the Prophet.

Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School, Oxford. With a Short Preface in Answer to Dr. Rowland Williams. By E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. *Seventh Thousand.* 8vo., 10s. 6d.

The Minor Prophets;

With a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Several Books. By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. 4to., *sewed*, Six Parts, 5s. each.

Part I. contains HOSEA—JOEL, INTRODUCTION.

Part II. JOEL, INTRODUCTION—AMOS vi. 6.

Part III. AMOS vi. 6 to end—OBADIAH—JONAH—MICAH i. 12.

Part IV. MICAH i. 13 to NAHUM, end.

Part V. HABAKKUK, ZEPHANIAH, HAGGAI ii. 21.

Part VI. is in a forward state.

The Prophecies of Isaiah.

Their Authenticity and Messianic Interpretation Vindicated, in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By the Very Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d. X

A Plain Commentary on the Book of Psalms

(Prayer-book Version), chiefly grounded on the Fathers. For the Use of Families. 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

The Psalter and the Gospel.

The Life, Sufferings, and Triumph of our Blessed Lord, revealed in the Book of Psalms. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s.

A Summary of the Evidences for the Bible.

By the Rev. T. S. ACKLAND, M.A., late Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge; Incumbent of Pollington cum Balne, Yorkshire. 24mo., cloth, 3s.

The Student's Manual of Scripture Names,

In Alphabetical Order; with Scripture References, and Short Historical Notices. For the Use of Schools, and Students preparing for Public Examinations. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 3s.

Catena Aurea.

A Commentary on the Four Gospels, collected out of the Works of the Fathers by S. THOMAS AQUINAS. Uniform with the Library of the Fathers. A Re-issue, complete in 6 vols., cloth, £2 2s.

A Plain Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels,

Intended chiefly for Devotional Reading. By the Rev. J. W. BURGON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, and Gresham Lecturer in Divinity. New Edition. 5 vols., Fcap. 8vo., limp cloth, £1 1s.

The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark

Vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and Established, by JOHN W. BURGON, B.D., Vicar of S. Mary-the-Virgin's, Fellow of Oriel College, and Gresham Lecturer in Divinity. With Facsimiles of Codex N and Codex L. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

The Gospels from a Rabbinical Point of View,

Shewing the perfect Harmony of the Four Evangelists on the subject of our Lord's Last Supper, and the Bearing of the Laws and Customs of the Jews at the time of our Lord's coming on the Language of the Gospels. By the Rev. G. WILDON PIERITZ, M.A. Crown 8vo., limp cloth, 3s.

Christianity as Taught by S. Paul.

By WILLIAM J. IRONS, D.D., of Queen's College, Oxford; Prebendary of S. Paul's; being the BAMPTON LECTURES for the Year 1870, with an Appendix of the CONTINUOUS SENSE of S. Paul's Epistles; with Notes and Metalegomena. 8vo., cloth, with Map, 14s.

S. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Philippians.

A Practical and Exegetical Commentary. Edited by the late Rev. HENRY NEWLAND. 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

Reflections in a Lent Reading of the Epistle to the Romans.

By the late Rev. C. MARRIOTT. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 3s.

JAMES PARKER AND CO.,

A History of the Church,

From the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Second Edition. Post 8vo., 10s. 6d.

The Age of the Martyrs;

Or, The First Three Centuries of the Work of the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By JOHN DAVID JENKINS, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford; Canon of Pieter Maritzburg. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

The Councils of the Church,

From the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; chiefly as to their Constitution, but also as to their Objects and History. By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

The Ecclesiastical History of the First Three Centuries,

From the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ to the year 313. By the late Rev. Dr. BURTON. Fourth edition. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

A Brief History of the Christian Church,

From the First Century to the Reformation. By the Rev. J. S. BARTLETT. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

Ordinum Sacrorum in Ecclesia Anglicana Defensio,

Unacum Statutis, Documentis, et Testimoniis ordinum Anglicanorum valorem probantibus; et Registro Consecrationis Archiepiscopi Parkeri, in Bibliotheca Lambethæ Asservato, Photozincographice expresso. Editore T. J. BAILEY, B.A. Large Folio, cloth, £1 10s.

A Defence of Holy Orders in the Church of England,

Including the Statutes, Documents, and other Evidence attesting the Validity of Anglican Orders. Edited by the Rev. T. J. BAILEY, B.A., C.C. Coll., Cambridge. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

Manual of Ecclesiastical History,

From the First to the Twelfth Century inclusive. By the
Rev. E. S. FROULKES, M.A. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

**History of the so-called Jansenist Church
of Holland ;**

With a Sketch of its Earlier Annals, and some Account of the
Brothers of the Common Life. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE,
Warden of Sackville College. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

A History of the English Church,

From its Foundation to the Reign of Queen Mary. By MARY
CHARLOTTE STAPLEY. Third Edition, revised, with a Re-
commendatory Notice by DEAN HOOK. Crown 8vo., cloth, 5s.

**Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the
English Nation.**

A New Translation by the Rev. L. GIDLEY, M.A., Chaplain of
St. Nicholas', Salisbury. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

St. Paul in Britain ;

Or, The Origin of 'British as Opposed to Papal Christianity.
By the Rev. R. W. MORGAN. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s.

Peter the Apostle never at Rome,

Shewn to be a Historical Fact: with a Dissertation of the
Apostolic Authority of the Symbol (or Creed) of the Church.
By J. H. BROWN, M.A. Post 8vo., limp cloth, 2s. 6d.

Scotland and the Scottish Church.

By the Rev. H. CASWALL, M.A., Author of "America and the
American Church," &c. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

**The Sufferings of the Clergy during the
Great Rebellion.**

By the Rev. JOHN WALKER, M.A. Epitomised by the Author
of "The Annals of England." Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

The Principles of Divine Service ;

Or, An Inquiry concerning the True Manner of Understanding and Using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Ven. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Vicar of Thorverton, Archdeacon of Exeter, &c. 2 vols. 8vo., cl., 16s.

A History of the Book of Common Prayer,

And other Authorized Books, from the Reformation ; with an Account of the State of Religion in England from 1640 to 1660. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. Second Edition, with an Index. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

Catechetical Lessons on the Book of Common Prayer.

Illustrating the Prayer-book, from its Title-page to the end of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels. Designed to aid the Clergy in Public Catechising. By the Rev. Dr. FRANCIS HESSEY, Incumbent of St. Barnabas, Kensington, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed,

For the Use of Persons beginning the Study of Theology. By A. P. FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. Second Edition, Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles.

By A. P. FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. With an Epistle Dedicatory to the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Second Edition, in one vol., Post 8vo., 12s.

Addresses to the Candidates for Ordination on the Questions in the Ordination Service.

By the late SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. Fifth Thousand. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

A Commentary on the Epistles and Gospels in the Book of Common Prayer.

Extracted from Writings of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West. With an Introductory Notice by the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S. In Four Parts. Part I. ADVENT—QUINQUAGESIMA. Crown 8vo., 3s.

Part II. ASH-WEDNESDAY to TUESDAY IN WHITSUN WEEK. 4s. 6d.

On Eucharistical Adoration.

With Considerations suggested by a Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist. By the late Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. 24mo., sewed, 2s.

Cur Deus Homo, or Why God was made Man;

By ST. ANSELM, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. Translated into English, with an Introduction, &c. Second Edition, Fcap. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

The Administration of the Holy Spirit

IN THE BODY OF CHRIST. The Bampton Lectures for 1868. By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY. Second Edition. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Sayings ascribed to our Lord

By the Fathers and other Primitive Writers, and Incidents in His Life narrated by them, otherwise than found in Scripture. By JOHN THEODORE DODD, B.A., late Junior Student of Christ Church. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s.

The Pastoral Rule of S. Gregory.

Sancti Gregorii Papæ Regulæ Pastoralis Liber, ad JOHANNEM, Episcopum Civitatis Ravenne. With an English Translation. By the Rev. H. B. BRAMLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

The Canons.

The Definitions of the Catholic Faith and Canons of Discipline of the First Four General Councils of the Universal Church. In Greek and English. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d. THE CANONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. See Catalogue, p. 3.

De Fide et Symbolo:

Documenta quedam nec non Aliquorum SS. Patrum Tractatus. Edidit CAROLUS A. HEURTLEY, S.T.P., Dom. Margarete Prælector, et Edis Christi Canonicus. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 4s. 6d.

Analecta Christiana,

In usum Titionum. Edidit et Annotationibus illustravit C. MARRIOTT, S.T.B. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

The Athanasian Creed.

A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed, by the Rev. DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria.

The Three Epistles (ad Nestorium, ii., iii., et ad Joan Antioch). A Revised Text, with an old Latin Version and an English Translation. Edited by P. E. PUSEY, M.A. 8vo., in wrapper, 3s.

S. Aurelius Augustinus, Episcopus Hippoensis,

De Catechizandis Rudibus, de Fide Rerum quæ non videntur, de Utilitate credendi. In Usum Juniorum. Edidit C. MARRIOTT, S.T.B., olim Coll. Oriel. Socius. A New Edition, Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

The Nicene Creed.

Defensio Fidei Nicenæ. A Defence of the Nicene Creed out of the extant writings of the Catholic Doctors who flourished during the three first centuries of the Christian Church. By GEORGE BULL, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. A new Translation. 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.

The Book of Bertram

The Priest and Monk of Corbey, commonly called Bertram, on the Body and Blood of the Lord. (Latin and English.) To which is added AN APPENDIX, containing the Saxon Homily of Ælfric. Fcap. 8vo. [Nearly ready.

Works of the Standard English Divines,
PUBLISHED IN THE LIBRARY OF ANGLO-CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

At the following prices in Cloth.

- Andrewes' (Bp.) Complete Works.** 11 vols., 8vo., £3 7s.
THE SERMONS. (Separate.) 5 vols., £1 15s.
- Beveridge's (Bp.) Complete Works.** 12 vols., 8vo., £4 4s.
THE ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS, 10 vols., £3 10s.
- Bramhall's (Abp.) Works, with Life and Letters, &c.**
5 vols., 8vo., £1 15s. (Vol. 2 cannot be sold separately.)
- Bull's (Bp.) Harmony on Justification.** 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
——— **Defence of the Nicene Creed.** 2 vols., 10s.
——— **Judgment of the Catholic Church.** 5s.
- Cosin's (Bp.) Works Complete.** 5 vols., 8vo., £1 10s.
(Vol. 1 cannot be sold separately.)
- Crakanthorp's Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.** 8vo., 7s.
- Frank's Sermons.** 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
- Forbes' Considerationes Modestæ.** 2 vols., 8vo., 12s.
- Gunning's Paschal, or Lent Fast.** 8vo., 6s.
- Hammond's Practical Catechism.** 8vo., 5s.
——— **Miscellaneous Theological Works.** 5s.
——— **Thirty-one Sermons.** 2 Parts. 10s.
- Hickes's Two Treatises on the Christian Priesthood.**
3 vols., 8vo., 15s.
- Johnson's (John) Theological Works.** 2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
——— **English Canons.** 2 vols., 12s.
- Laud's (Abp.) Complete Works.** 7 vols., (9 Parts,) 8vo.,
£2 17s.
- L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices.** 8vo., 6s.
- Marshall's Penitential Discipline.** (This volume cannot
be sold separate from the complete set.)
- Nicholson's (Bp.) Exposition of the Catechism.** (This
volume cannot be sold separate from the complete set.)
- Overall's (Bp.) Convocation-book of 1606.** 8vo., 5s.
- Pearson's (Bp.) Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii.**
2 vols., 8vo., 10s.
- Thorndike's (Herbert) Theological Works Complete.**
6 vols., (10 Parts,) 8vo., £2 10s.
- Wilson's (Bp.) Works Complete.** With **Life**, by Rev.
J. KEBLE. 7 vols., (8 Parts,) 8vo., £3 3s.

The Catechist's Manual;

With an Introduction by the late SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. 5th Thousand. Cr. 8vo., limp cl., 5s.

The Confirmation Class-book:

Notes for Lessons, with APPENDIX, containing Questions and Summaries for the Use of the Candidates. By EDWARD M. HOLMES, LL.B., Rector of Marsh Gibbon, Bucks, and Diocesan Inspector of Schools: Author of the "Catechist's Manual." Fcap. 8vo., limp cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE QUESTIONS, separate, 4 sets, in wrapper, 1s.

THE SUMMARIES, separate, 4 sets, in wrapper, 1s.

The Church's Work in our Large Towns.

By GEORGE HUNTINGTON, M.A., Rector of Tenby, and Domestic Chaplain of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres. Second Edit., revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo., cl. 6s.

The Church and the School:

Containing Practical Hints on the Work of a Clergyman. By H. W. BELLAIRES, M.A., One of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. Cheap re-issue, Crown 8vo., limp cloth, 2s. 6d.

Notes of Seven Years' Work in a Country Parish.

By R. F. WILSON, M.A., Prebendary of Sarum, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 4s.

A Manual of Pastoral Visitation,

Intended for the Use of the Clergy in their Visitation of the Sick and Afflicted. By A PARISH PRIEST. Dedicated, by permission, to His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin. Second Edition, Crown 8vo., limp cloth, 3s. 6d.; roan, 4s.

The Cure of Souls.

By the Rev. G. ARDEN, M.A., Rector of Winterborne-Came, and Author of "Breviates from Holy Scripture," &c. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

Questions on the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels,

Throughout the Year. Edited by the Rev. T. L. CLAUGHTON, Vicar of Kidderminster. For the Use of Teachers in Sunday Schools. Fifth Edition, 18mo., cl. In two Parts, each 2s. 6d.

Pleas for the Faith.

Especially designed for the use of Missionaries at Home and Abroad. By the Rev. W. SOMERVILLE LACH SZYRMA, M.A., St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. Fcap. 8vo., cl., 2s. 6d.

MEDITATIONS FOR THE FORTY DAY OF LENT.

With a Prefatory Notice by the ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.
18mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

DAILY STEPS TOWARDS HEAVEN.

A small pocket volume containing a few PRACTICAL THOUGHTS
on the GOSPEL HISTORY, with Texts for Every Day in the
Year. Seventeenth Edition. 32mo., roan, 2s. 6d. X

ANNUS DOMINI.

A Prayer for each Day of the Year, founded on a Text of Holy
Scripture. By CHRISTINA G. ROSSETTI. 32mo., cl., 3s. 6d. X

LITURGIA DOMESTICA :

Services for every Morning and Evening in the Week. Third
Edition. 18mo., 2s. Or in two Parts, 1s. each.

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

Four Books. By THOMAS A KEMPIS. Small 4to., printed on
thick toned paper, with red border-lines, mediæval title-pages,
ornamental initials, &c. Third Thousand. Cloth, 12s.

DE IMITATIONE CHRISTI.

Thomas à Kempis De Imitatione Christi. Libri Quatuor. New
Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

EVENING WORDS.

Brief Meditations on the Introductory Portion of Our Lord's
Last Discourse with His Disciples. 16mo., cloth, 2s.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST;

Or, Meditations on the Death and Passion of Our Blessed Lord
and Saviour. Edited by WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D.,
F.R.S., Dean of Chichester. Crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER.

DEVOTIONS BEFORE AND AFTER HOLY COMMUNION. With
Preface by J. KEBLE. Fifth Edition, in red and black, on
toned paper, 32mo., cloth, 2s.

The above, with the Service, cloth, 2s. 6d.

DEVOUT COMMUNION, from HORST. 18mo., cloth, 1s.

OFFICIUM EUCHARISTICUM. By EDWARD LAKE, D.D. New
Edition. 32mo., cloth, 1s. 6d.

A SHORT AND PLAIN INSTRUCTION FOR THE BETTER UNDER-
STANDING OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By BISHOP WILSON.
32mo., with Rubrics, cloth, gilt edges, 2s.

————— 32mo., limp cloth, 8d.; sewed, 6d.

————— 24mo., limp cloth, 1s.

Oxford Editions of Devotional Works.

Fcap. 8vo., chiefly printed in Red and Black, on Toned Paper.

Andrewes' Devotions.

DEVOTIONS. By the Right Rev. LANCELOT ANDREWES. Translated from the Greek and Latin, and arranged anew. Cloth, 5s.

The Imitation of Christ.

FOUR BOOKS. By THOMAS A KEMPIS. A new Edition, revised. Cloth, 4s.

Land's Devotions.

THE PRIVATE DEVOTIONS of Dr. WILLIAM LAUD, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martyr. Antique cloth, 5s.

Spinkes' Devotions.

TRUE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN'S COMPANION IN THE CLOSET. By NATHANIEL SPINKES. Floriated borders, antique cloth, 4s.

Sutton's Meditations.

GODLY MEDITATIONS UPON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. By CHRISTOPHER SUTTON, D.D., late Prebend of Westminster. A new Edition. Antique cloth, 5s.

Taylor's Golden Grove.

THE GOLDENGROVE: A Choice Manual, containing what is to be Believed, Practised, and Desired or Prayed for. By Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. Antique cloth, 3s. 6d.

Taylor's Holy Living.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY LIVING. By Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. Ant. cloth, 4s.

Taylor's Holy Dying.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY DYING. By Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. Ant. cloth, 4s.

Wilson's Sacra Privata.

THE PRIVATE MEDITATIONS, DEVOTIONS, and PRAYERS of the Right Rev. T. WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Now first printed entire. Cloth, 4s.

Ancient Collects.

ANCIENT COLLECTS AND OTHER PRAYERS, Selected for Devotional Use from various Rituals, with an Appendix on the Collects in the Prayer-book. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D. Fourth Edition. Antique cloth, 5s.

Devout Communicant.

THE DEVOUT COMMUNICANT, exemplified in his Behaviour before, at, and after the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: Practically suited to all the Parts of that Solemn Ordinance. 7th Edition, revised. Edited by Rev. G. MOULTRE. Fcap. 8vo., toned paper, red lines, ant. cl., 4s.

EIKON BASILIKH.

THE PORTRAITURE OF HIS SACRED MAJESTY KING CHARLES I. in his Solitudes and Sufferings. Cloth, 5s.

JAMES PARKER AND CO.,

THE AUTHORIZED EDITIONS OF
THE CHRISTIAN YEAR,

With the Author's latest Corrections and Additions.

NOTICE.—Messrs. PARKER are the sole Publishers of the Editions of the "Christian Year" issued with the sanction and under the direction of the Author's representatives. All Editions without their imprint are unauthorized.

SMALL 4to. EDITION. s. d.		48mo. EDITION. s. d.	
Handsomely printed on toned paper, with red border lines and initial letters. Cl. extra	10 6	Cloth, limp	0 6
		Cloth boards	0 9
		Roan	1 6
FOOLSCAP 8vo. EDITION.		FACSIMILE OF THE 1st EDITION, with a list of the variations from the Original Text which the Author made in later Editions.	
Cloth	3 6	2 vols., 12mo., boards	7 6
24mo. EDITION.			
Cloth	2 0		
32mo. EDITION.			
Cloth, limp	1 0		
Cloth boards, gilt edges	1 6		

By the same Author.

LYRA INNOCENTIIUM. Thoughts in Verse on Christian Children. *Thirteenth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo., cl., 5s.

— 48mo. edition, limp cloth, 6d.; cloth boards, 1s.

MISCELLANEOUS POEMS BY THE REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. *Third Edition.* Fcap., cloth, 6s.

THE PSALTER, OR PSALMS OF DAVID: In English Verse. *Fourth Edition.* Fcap., cloth, 6s.

By the late Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS.

THE CATHEDRAL; or, The Catholic and Apostolic Church in England. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.; 32mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE BAPTISTERY; or, The Way of Eternal Life, with Plates by BOETIUS A BOLSWERT. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.; 32mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

HYMNS FROM THE PARISIAN BREVIARY. 32mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR. Fcap. 8vo., cl., 5s.; 32mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS IN PAST YEARS. 32mo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE SEVEN DAYS; or, The Old and New Creation. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

OXFORD, AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

THE LATE BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford: Second Series, from 1847 to 1862. By the late SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIRD SERIES, from 1863 to 1870. 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Vol. I. From Advent to Whitsuntide. Seventh Edition. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Vol. II. Sixth Edition. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Vol. III. Reprinted from the "Plain Sermons by Contributors to the 'Tracts for the Times.'" Revised Edition, 8vo., cloth, 6s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS preached and printed on Various Occasions. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford, between A.D. 1859 and 1872. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

LENTEN SERMONS, preached chiefly to Young Men at the Universities, between A.D. 1858—1874. 8vo., cloth, 6s.

ELEVEN SHORT ADDRESSES during a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus, engaged in Perpetual Intercession for the Conversion of Sinners. 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

SERMONS ON THE BEATITUDES, with others mostly preached before the University of Oxford; to which is added a Preface relating to the volume of "Essays and Reviews." New Edition. Crown 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

REV. J. KEBLE.

SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, Author of the "Christian Year." LENT TO PASSION-TIDE. 8vo., 6s.

Other volumes are to follow at intervals:—(1.) On Oct. 1, Advent Sermons; (2.) On Dec. 1, Sermons from Christmas to Septuagesima. Subsequently Sermons for Easter-tide, the Trinity Season, and for Saints' Days.

VILLAGE SERMONS ON THE BAPTISMAL SERVICE. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

SERMONS, OCCASIONAL AND PAROCHIAL. 8vo., cloth, 12s.

REV. H. HARRIS, B.D.

THE TWO BLASPHEMIES. Five Sermons on The Blasphemy against the Son of Man, and The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: preached before the University of Oxford, by HENRY HARRIS, B.D., Rector of Winterbourne Bassett. Crown 8vo., limp cloth, 3s. 6d.

JAMES PARKER AND CO.,

TWENTY SHORT ALLEGORICAL SERMONS.

By B. K. W. PEARSE, M.A., Rector of Ascot, Staines, and
W. A. GRAY, M.A., Vicar of Arksey, Yorkshire.

CONTENTS:—The City of the Lost; The Prisoner of Hope; The Soldier; The Hounds; The Slaves; The Stone of Separation; The Stranger; The Unnatural Sentence; The Guest-chamber; The Exile; The Three Fields; The Hidden Power; The Monster; The House; Summer and Winter; The Bride; The Ruin Rebuilt; The Passers-by; The Cloud; The Shadow. Fourth Edition, Fcap. 8vo., toned paper, cloth, 2s. 6d.

REV. E. MONRO.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF FAITH. Eight Plain Sermons:—Abel; Enoch; Noah; Abraham; Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph; Moses; The Walls of Jericho; Conclusions. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.
Plain Sermons on the Book of Common Prayer. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

Historical and Practical Sermons on the Sufferings and Resurrection of our Lord. 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 10s.

Sermons on New Testament Characters. Fcap. 8vo., 4s.

LENTEN SERMONS AT OXFORD.

The Series for 1859. Fcap.	For 1866. 8vo., cl., 7s. 6d.
8vo., cloth, 5s.	For 1867. 8vo., cl., 7s. 6d.
For 1863. 8vo., cl., 7s. 6d.	For 1868. 8vo., cl., 5s.
For 1865. 8vo., cl., 7s. 6d.	For 1869. 8vo., cl., 7s. 6d.

SHORT SERMONS FOR FAMILY READING,

Following the Course of the Christian Seasons. First Series.

By the Rev. J. W. BURGON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary-the-Virgin's, Oxford. 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 8s.

SECOND SERIES. 2 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 8s.

RT. REV. J. ARMSTRONG, D.D.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. By the late Lord Bishop of Grahams-town. Fifth Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

SERMONS on the Fasts and Festivals. Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN SEASONS.

SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN SEASONS. First Series. Edited by JOHN ARMSTRONG, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Grahams-town. 4 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 16s.

Second Series. Edited by the Rev. JOHN BARROW, D.D., late Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. 4 vols., Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 16s.

OXFORD, AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

A SERIES OF TALES ILLUSTRATING CHURCH HISTORY.

Each of the following separately. Price One Shilling.

- I. The CAVE in the HILLS; or, Cæcilius Viriāthus.
 II. The EXILES of the CEBENNA.
 III. The CHIEF'S DAUGHTER.
 IV. The LILY of TIFLIS.
 V. WILD SCENES AMONGST THE CELTS.
 VI. The LAZAR-HOUSE of LEBROS.
 VII. The RIVALS: a Tale of the Anglo-Saxon Church.
 VIII. The CONVERT of MASSACHUSETTS.
 IX. The QUAY of the DIOSCURI: a Tale of Nicene Times.
 X. The BLACK DANES.
 XI. The CONVERSION of ST. VLADIMIR.
 XII. The SEA-TIGERS: a Tale of Mediæval Nestorianism.
 XIII. The CROSS in SWEDEN.
 XIV. The ALLELUIA BATTLE; or, Pelagianism in Britain.
 XV. The BRIDE of RAMCUTTAH.
 XVI. ALICE of FOBHING.
 XVII. The NORTHERN LIGHT.
 XVIII. AUBREY DE L'ORNE; or, The Times of St. Anselm.
 XIX. LUCIA'S MARRIAGE.
 XX. WOLFINGHAM.
 XXI. THE FORSAKEN; or, The Times of St. Dunstan.
 XXII. THE DOVE OF TABENNA; and THE RESCUE.
 XXIII. LABACHE: a Tale of the Portuguese Church.
 XXIV. WALTER THE ARMOURER; or, The Interdict.
 XXV. THE CATECHUMENS of the COROMANDEL COAST.
 XXVI. THE DAUGHTERS OF FOLA.
 XXVII. AGNES MARTIN; or, The Fall of Wolsey.
 XXVIII. ROSE AND MINNIE; or, The Loyalists.
 XXIX. DORES DE GUALDIM; a Tale of the Portuguese Revolution of 1640.

Or in Volumes, cloth, lettered, 5s. each.

- Vol. I. ENGLAND, vol. i. contains Nos. 1, 5, 7, 10 and 14.
 Vol. II. ENGLAND, vol. ii. contains Nos. 16, 18, 21, 24 and 27.
 Vol. III. AMERICA AND OUR COLONIES, contains Nos. 3, 8, 20, 25 and 28.
 Vol. IV. FRANCE AND SPAIN, contains Nos. 2, 22, 23 and 29.
 Vol. V. EASTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE, contains Nos. 6, 11, 13, 17 and 26.
 Vol. VI. ASIA AND AFRICA, contains Nos. 4, 9, 12, 15 and 19.

JAMES PARKER AND CO., OXFORD AND LONDON.

Date Loaned

[illegible]